PUBLISHERS OF LAW BOOKS
PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS
The Carswell Company

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
ONTARIO

106788

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
TORONTO
DEC 2 1953
RECEIVED

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
ONTARIO

106783

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XXII

Friday, March 13, 1953.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

106788

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12TH, 1953, ET SEQ.

Hon. (Rev.) M. C. Davies,
Speaker

- - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Friday, March 13, 1953,
2.00 o'clock p.m.

And the House having met.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the Commissioner of Estate Bills their report in the following case:

Bill No. 25, "An Act respecting Knox Church Toronto."

CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

"Alex. C. Lewis, Esquire, Q.C.,
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, Ontario.

Sir:

"Re: Private Bill No. 25, an Act
respecting Knox's Church, Toronto

"The undersigned as Commissioners of Estate Bills as provided by the Legislative Assembly Act, R.S.O.1950, chapter 202, section 57, having had the said Bill referred to us as such Commissioners, now beg to report thereon.

"We are of the opinion that it is reasonable that such Bill do pass into a law. We are of the further opinion that the provisions of the said Bill are proper for carrying its purpose into effect and that no alterations or amendments are necessary in the Bill.

"The Bill duly signed by the Commissioners and the Petition for the same are accordingly returned herewith.

"We have the honour to be

Sir,

Your obedient servants,

F. D. Hogg, J.A., R.I.Ferguson, J.

COMMISSIONERS OF ESTATE BILLS"

MR. SPEAKER: We are happy to welcome today students from Wellesley Street School, and also students from School Section No. 15, Moore, near the Town of Corunna, on the St. Clair River.

This morning we were happy to welcome to the Chamber students from the Hanover School in Grey County, at which time the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and myself addressed the

students.

It is, as I have said many times, a great pleasure for us to have the privilege of welcoming these students to our sittings day by day.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

MR. R. HERBERT (Temiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second report on Mining, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Herbert from the Committee on Mining presents the following as its second report:

> "Your Committee begs to report the following Bill with certain amendments:--
>
> "Bill No. 67, 'an Act to amend the Mining Act.'
>
> "All of which is respectfully submitted."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The Annual Report of the Inspector of Legal Offices, for the year ending December 31, 1952.

The 21st Annual Report of the Department of Public Welfare for the year ending December 31,1952.

The 23rd Annual Report of the Department of Labour of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1952.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the second annual report of the Alcoholic Foundation, but before doing so I should like to make a few remarks.

First of all, I want to pay tribute to the Alcoholic Foundation, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Arthur Kelly, Q.C. This Foundation has been working now a short two years. A great number of people, especially our lay people, feel that we can cure an alcoholic in three months, six months and so on. Research has already proven that is impossible. Alcoholism is a habit which, in the first, second, third, fourth and up to the fifth year, we could say the trend is toward relief, but not that it is a cure. May I say that they have found these people have a lack of adrenal substance in the blood stream and they all have the same psychological outlook. They all need a crutch when they meet any great problem, to meet disaster, or any trouble of any

kind, and if you take away one crutch they seek another. That is why it is so important we see that the so-called barbituates, embutols and others -- you all know the names -- are not easily procurable. When a man has become a chronic alcoholic and quits alcohol he often goes on to one of these other drugs as just another form of crutch. This, of course, is a much more serious problem.

I cannot pay too great a tribute to the work done by these ten men, who form our Foundation. Among these men we have four who belong to Alcoholic Anonymous. Under them we have the Medical Advisory Board, which is made up of representation, not only from Toronto University but also our other Universities, and here again we have representation from Alcoholics Anonymous. Let me say it was the Alcoholic Anonymous organization in the United States which has done such an outstanding work there, as well as here in Canada. It was this organization which asked for help from scientists, and asked the doctors to do research work. It would be our last thought to leave them out of this organization, because, as I will state later, they have a definite job to do.

Under the present legislation their work consists of reaearch, treatment and rehabilitation. That is one of the things we must remember. They have a great number of people come to them or write to them, asking for money for the prevention program, or other programs in the alcoholic field, which they have to refuse because it does not come under their legislation.

Let us take a look at these different things. Research is carried out by our Universities; then treatment, which is carried out by professional and non-professional personnel made up of doctors, nurses, social service workers; and the last part, rehabilitation, is carried out largely by the Alcoholics Anonymous. That is where they fit into the picture. They do an outstanding job.

Rehabilitation takes in quite a number of things. First of all, if a patient has been confined to a hospital,before he goes home, social service workers and Alcoholic Anonymous personnel have to visit the home and get his family ready for his homecoming; they have to visit the neighbours; they have to go to his place of employment, to industry, and they have to follow up each and every case for a period of

at least five years.

At the present time, fifty-three per cent of all those who have come to them -- I am not going to say that fifty-three per cent were cured, but the trend has been towards a cure; have not gone back to alcohol, nor have they gone back to any other form of drug. There are, of course, those who came to them who really did not want to be cured in their own hearts, and unless they do there is nothing anyone can do for them. I shall come to that later. Once a person has become a chronic alcoholic he can never take even one social drink again. A reformed alcoholic must absolutely refrain from taking even one drink for the rest of his life. I think that statement can only mean to you and to me that rehabilitation goes on as long as the person lives.

What parts do the other Departments of this Government play? In the past we have had -- as a matter of fact, almost since the beginning of time -- the Church, we have had the different organizations, dealing with this problem. I am not saying they have failed; as a matter of fact, they have done a terrific amount of good work, but in the last few years we have learned that we must

have a combination of many factors if we are going to deal with the problem.

First, we have the Department of Education. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) is placing in all the schools, literature to be used in their psychology lectures in the senior grades of the public schools and the junior grades of the high schools, where they are taught what harm alcohol does to the body.

Then, in the field of prevention, we have the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), and his Department may be called "Alcohol and Road Traffic." It would be of interest to hon. members to visit the International Convention which is being held in Toronto. This is the second of its kind, and is being held on September 9th to 12th this year.

May I here pay tribute to Mr. David Archibald, the Director of our Foundation, who has honoured us by being appointed Secretary of the International Association. I want to pay tribute also to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote), in dealing so efficiently with the alcoholic problem as it concerns the men confined in our reform institutions.

In conclusion, I would like to tell hon. members of this House the story of the Brookside Hospital and the present one being renovated at 11 Bedford Road, Toronto. Brookside Hospital was purchased by my predecessor in this Government. It was a beautiful place; as a matter of fact, there was only one problem, and that was that it was twenty to twenty-five miles from our clinic in Toronto. The expense of taking patients out, bringing them back and taking out other personnel was running into too large a sum of money.

The men who sold the Brookside Hospital were business men, and they sold it for the amount this Government paid, plus the cost of renovation, and they made a profit over and above that of about $5,000. With that money they bought two buildings, one at 9 Bedford Road and one at 11 Bedford Road. Our new clinic is at 9 Bedford Road, and it takes the place of 28 Avenue Road. There they have offices for all those people I have just mentioned; that is, medical personnel, nursing, social service workers and the Alcoholics Anonymous.

In the next building, which will be used as a hospital, there will be room for ten male and

two female. Statistics throughout Canada and the United States have proven that we require five beds for males, for every one for females. I cannot say that the Foundation has an option on another house in the immediate vicinity, but I expect they will have before very long.

(B-1 follows)

Each of the hon. members of this House will receive a letter from the Director inviting you to attend the opening of this place. I had hoped it would be during the session, but it only comes two or three weeks after the session. It will be some time between the 15th of April and the end of April, and I do want to give every one of the hon. members an invitation to come and see the clinic and the Hospital. I do not mean anything by that.

The only other thing I wish to say is that they are establishing twenty-three centres throughout Ontario, small centres which will take in the area around, and as a matter of fact, when I have the opportunity and privilege to speak to any of these organizations, I always tell them to remember this is for Ontario, not only Toronto.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I want to ask the hon. Minister a question, and also to express my doubt as to whether we should attend this opening ceremony of which he speaks, if the hon. Prime Minister is to have anything to do with the adjudication at that time. I am very doubtful if many of us would return, for some time at least.

I want to ask my hon. friend if he can tell the House how many institutions are operated for or by this foundation in Ontario, and to what

extent this government participates financially,

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Our contribution is $149,500, and in the first year, that is two years ago, we put in a project at Ottawa for $58,000. I am speaking from memory but these figures are very close and I think they are absolutely accurate. We sent in this project for $58,000 to cover certain professional equipment, etc. We did not receive one dollar from them in that particular year. This fiscal year, which is the second year, we received in the neighbourhood of $32,000. Does that answer your questions?

MR. OLIVER: How many institutions are there?

MR. PHILLIPS: We just have the present one now at 9-11 Bedford Road, about which I was speaking. As of the 20th of April, I would say, we have one hospital plus one clinic, we have three hospitals in Toronto, St. Michael's, the General, and the Western which have promised up to three beds any time it is necessary, and they are at the moment implementing these by twenty-three more.

There is research work being carried out in both Queen's University and Western University; Ottawa University will get the same chance as soon as they tell us that they have no facilities for research now.

MR. JOSEPH SALSBERG (St. Andrew): May I direct a question to the hon. Minister? Is the reason for the very limited number of beds which are now available in Toronto Hospitals one of finances, or is it a shortage of accommodation facilities? I raise this because of my own experience with the Foundation -- and I may say my experiences have been very good on behalf of patients. I found on a few occasions they just did not have the beds for emergency cases. They only had a few beds in St. Michael's and the other Hospitals mentioned, and they were not enough. Is it because they have not enough money? Could we help them by giving them additional funds, or is it a shortage of hospital space?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: We have nine beds available -- up to nine beds in the hospitals. They have never all been needed at the one time and I can assure the hon. members of this House that it is neither on account of finances nor on account of shortage of beds. I am speaking of chronic alcoholism and referring to three or four months ago when I attended a meeting. They have a meeting on the second Wednesday of every month, and I visited them last Fall. I asked them the question that the hon. member asked, and I was told that they never have more than five or six who require accommodation and hospital care, or you might say "acute treatments."

MR. SALSBERG: It did happen, Mr. Speaker, in an instance not so long ago.

HON. MR.PHILLIPS: If they will 'phone me, I will take care of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): I would like to say a word on this question if I am in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter is not open to debate at the moment.

MR. DEMPSEY: I just wanted to say a word in favour of this institution.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow the hon. member to speak because I know he has something to say on it.

MR. DEMPSEY: I am a member of the Alcoholics Anonymous, and I am very proud of it. I think this Government is to be commended for starting this. The hon. member (Mr.Salsberg) asked about beds. It is a brand new thing which has only been in operation for the past few years. Our late minister (Mr.Kelly), was very much interested in this and I know from meeting many other "AA's"that they really commend the Government for starting it. I think it is a splendid thing.

It is a beginning and something that is greatly needed in this country, because speaking as an AA, our hearts and souls are in this job

if we can help our fellowmen along. The government is concerned with the possibility of a shortage of funds, and they are looking into the situation to see what can be done about it, and I commend the government for taking action in this matter.

HON. MR. FROST: I beg to table answers to questions 64, 72, 66, 52 and 6.

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity of telling the House at this time, as I know some of the hon. members want to get away a little earlier and may not be here when the House adjourns, that on Monday we are planning to deal, in committee, with Part I of Bill No. 80, secondly the Department of Labour estimates, and probably the supplementary estimates that were introduced in the house yesterday.

In connection with the supplementary estimates, that is, the payment to hospitals, I have a question directed to me by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas). He asked me when the special hospital grant, -- the rehabilitation grant, if I may put it that way -- will be paid. It was planned they would be paid before the 30th of April this year. For that reason I would like to get the supplementary estimates passed, because there are some matters to settle with individual hospitals and we would like the cheques to be in their hands before the end of next month.

THIRD READINGS

On motions the following Bills were read for the third time:

Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the Board of Education of the Town of Port Colborne", Mr. Weaver in the absence of Mr. Morningstar.

Bill No. 19, "An Act Respecting the City of Owen Sound, Mr. Murdoch in the absence of Mr. Downer.

Bill No. 21, "An Act Respecting the City of Welland", Mr. Herbert in the absence of Mr. Morningstar.

Bill No. 27, "An Act Respecting the Town of Brampton", Mr. Murdoch, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy.

Bill No. 10, "An Act Respecting Assumption College", Mr. Murdoch.

Bill No. 22, "An Act Respecting Societe Nationale de Fiducie," Mr. Brandon.

Bill No. 38, "An Act to Amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act", Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 43, "An Act to Amend the County Judges Act,"Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 44, "An Act to Amend the General Sessions Act", Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 45, "An Act to Amend the County Courts Act," Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 46, "An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Expenses Act." Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 48, "An Act to amend The Division Courts Act." Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 49, "An Act to amend The Assignment of Book Debts Act." Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 51, "An Act to amend The Chattel Mortgages Act." Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 52, "An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act". Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 54, "An Act to amend The Devolution of Estates Act", Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act." Mr. Kelly.

Bill No. 73, "An Act to amend The Canada Company's Land Act", Mr. Kelly.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bills do now pass and be intituled as in the motions.

YOUNG MEN AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, LONDON.

Mr. Morrow, in the absence of Mr. Robarts, moved second reading of Bill No. 5, "An Act to Incorporate the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association of London."

Motion agreed to, second reading of the Bill.

THE TOWN OF ORILLIA

Mr. Murdoch, in the absence of Mr. McPhee moved second reading of Bill No: 28, "An Act Respecting the Town of Orillia".

Motion agreed to, second reading of the Bill.

THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

Mr. Porter moved second reading of Bill No. 78, "An Act to amend the Summary Convictions Act".

Motion agreed to, second reading of the Bill, and Bill referred to the Legal Bills Committee.

(D follows)

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moved second reading of Bill No. 107, "An Act to amend The Judicature Act".

He said: I would like this Bill to be roferred to the Legal Bills Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill. Bill No. 107 referred to the Legal Bills Committee.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I beg to inform the House that the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of Resolution No. 10 on the Order Paper, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Welsh:

> "That, where the fees of the office of the registrar of deeds are insufficient in respect of contributions to be paid into the Public Service Superannuation Fund, the balance shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.
>
> as provided by Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Public Service Act."

Resolution agreed to.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF FORT WILLIAM

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Nineteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 1, "An Act to incorporate The Roman Catholic Bishop of Fort William", Mr. Mapledoram.

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 1 reported.

RIVERSIDE CEMETERY COMPANY OF PORT ARTHUR

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twentieth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the Riverside Cemetery Company of Port Arthur", Mr. Wardrope.

Sections 1 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A and B agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 6 reported.

CITY OF BRANTFORD

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-first Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Brantford," Mr. Gordon.

Section 1 (as amended) to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 16 reported.

CITY OF LONDON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-second Order, House in Committee on Bill No, 20, "An Act respecting the City of London", Mr. Robarts, (London).

Sections 1 6o 12 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 20 reported.

THE LAKESHORE DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-third Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Lakeshore District Board of Education", Mr. Brandon.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 24 reported.

THE HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting The Hospital for Sick Children", Mr. Roberts,(St.Patrick)

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

The preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 33 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain Bills and a certain

Resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain Bills without amendment and a certain Resolution, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

THE RESEARCH COUNCIL ACT, 1948

Hon. Mr. Warrender moved second reading of Bill No. 68, "An Act to amend The Research Council Act, 1948".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Hon. Mr. Phillips moved second reading of Bill No. 75, "An Act to amend The Public Health Act".

Motion agreed to;.second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) advise if he would like this Bill referred to the Health Committee?

HON.MR. PHILLIPS: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we are going to discuss all these Bills in the Health Committee, and this Bill might accompany

them.

---Bill No. 75 referred to the Committee on Health.

THE CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moved second reading of Bill No. 76, "An Act to amend The Certified Public Accountants Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill gives to the certified public accountants powers similar to those which were given to the Chartered Accountants by another Bill which passed second reading in this House.

It merely provides the Certified Accoutants Association -- which is a very large Association of accountants throughout the province -- may purchase or otherwise acquire land, and erect buildings thereon, for its own use, and also it permits the leasing of any part of those buildings as office space, to others, so long as the Association does not need the space for its own purposes. It is considered quite reasonable that the same type of powers which were given to one of the large branches of the accounting profession, should be given to others at their request. They are a responsible body of men, and I considered this a very reasonable power to give them.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, there is only one question I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General, and that is whether this was requested by the Organization? In other words, does it comply with their wishes?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This has been done entirely at their request. They wished this power, and we thought it was perfectly reasonable.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Porter moved second reading of Bill No. 77, "An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act".

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious to make sure, in view of some experiences we have just had, that legislation of this sort is requested by the bodies which are most concerned with the problem. Insofar as this Act is concerned, I doubt whether my question will be within the confines and limitations of a discussion of the Bill on second reading.

How shall we go about selecting the people to fill these positions? It seems that very highly-qualified people are required, and perhaps that could

hardly be considered as within a discussion on the principles of the Bill. In view of the fact that the hon. Attorney-General wanted some comment, I accommodated him.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I am very much obliged to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) for inviting me to make a speech on this Bill or even beyond the Bill. I am quite prepared to answer the question, which I think is very proper, even though it may be a little beyond the scope of the Bill itself, because it opens the whole practice behind the Juvenile Courts.

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members are no doubt aware, Juvenile judges are appointed by the province, and the practice which is followed generally in my office is that when a Juvenile Court is requested in a municipality, and the necessary orders are passed to establish it, it is as a result of certain activities on the part of social service organizations in the municipalities, generally at the instance of people who are chiefly concerned with work of this kind, and who work with juveniles, and know some of their problems, such as Children's Aid Societies, and other similar organizations, and it frequently happens that it is as a result of pressure from these groups that municipal councils

take the step of requesting a Juvenile Court to be established.

The same practice occurs frequently with respect to the appointment of a judge of that Court. I invariably have recommendations from a number of social welfare groups interested in these matters. Sometimes they agree on one person whom they think is suitable, and sometimes they disagree, in which event, the difficult problem is on my desk to decide who of the various people whose names have been put forward should be appointed to the position. In most cases, it has been possible to select someone who is generally acceptable to the groups of people concerned. That is the practice which is followed. Of course, we have to use our best judgment, but generally we have very sound guidance from the people who know most about the problems, and who are chiefly concerned with the activities of the Court.

This Bill is really designed in the interest of full-time judges, of whom there are not very many in the province, but there are a few. In most places, the Juvenile Court judge is either the County Judge or the Magistrate, who acts as a Juvenile Court Judge on a part-time basis, and is paid accordingly. By the provisions of this Bill they will be in the same position as, that in which the Magistrates were

put a few years ago. It will enable them to get the cost-of-living bonus, where now they are not entitled to it, and it will also entitle them to participate in superannuation.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Attorney-General will permit, may I ask him if his Department followed that procedure in the recent appointment in Windsor.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had a number of representations from social service organizations, who very strongly recommended that the present Judge be appointed.

MR. SALSBERG: The labour organizations, as I understand it, had some very definite opinions, and tried to exercise some influence.

HON. MR. PORTER: I do not recall I had any definite recommendations from the labour organizations as such. I believe they expressed their views through certain social service organizations. I understand that some of the people who came to see me were members of some of the labour organizations in Windsor, but they did not come to me, as an organization; they came with a group as a whole representing a number of organizations in Windsor. They made recommendations, and those recommendations were carried out.

(TAKE D FOLLOWS)

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS' ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Separate Schools' Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill, and Bill referred to the Committee on Education.

THE HIGH SCHOOLS ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 92, "An Act to amend The High Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill, and Bill referred to the Committee on Education.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 93, "An Act to amend The Department of Education Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill, and Bill to be referred to the Committee on Education.

SCHOOL TRUSTEES' AND TEACHERS' BOARDS OF REFERENCE ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 94, "The School Trustees' and Teachers' Boards of Reference Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill, and Bill referred to the Committee on Education.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 74, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill which I am presenting for second reading is, I am sure, self-explanatory. There is very little in it which requires explanation, as the Act sets out just what its purpose is. I think it can be said that it is a fact the Workmen's Compensation Act is constantly being reviewed to bring in amendments to better the legislation. For years it has been said that the Ontario Act has been copied in most provinces and a great many states of the Union, and, as a matter of fact, in a great many countries of the world. That is, the actual theme of the Act has been copied. No other country has an Act as comprehensive or gives protection to workers to the extent the Ontario Act does, at the cost that is required to administer it.

This Workmen's Compensation Act was established, as we all know, many years ago, and I contemplate giving a little more extended review at a later date in the Session regarding the Act itself. The Act was reviewed by a Commissioner, Mr. Justice Roach, a few years ago, and certain recommendations were made, and a great many of those recommendations have already been carried out, and one or two clauses in this new amendment are an added effort to bring into effect some of the recommendations by Mr. Justice Roach.

For instance, Section 1: at present an employer is only assessed on the wages of workmen employed outside Ontario, where such employment lasts less than six months, and the workmen in case of accident are only entitled to compensation during that period. The amendment follows the request of many employers who desired coverage for their employees for a longer period.

Another Section deals with the question of double payment. Employers sending their men into other provinces to work are required to pay our own compensation assessment and cover them in the other province, as in Quebec, and it makes a dual payment. A section in this Act endeavours to give the Board the power of reciprocity, as it

were, to deal with each and every Province and endeavour to work out a system which will eliminate that double payment.

The main section in the Act, Mr. Speaker, provide for pensions being increased. Where the widow or invalid husband is the sole dependent, the monthly payment is increased from $60 to $70; the monthly compensation to a widow or invalid husband, with one child or more, is increased from $50 to $75; the children's payments, which are now $12, are increased to $25; and the children's payments on the death of a widow are increased from $20 to $35. Where the dependents are children, the monthly payment is increased from $20 to $35. That is quite an increase in the payments to widows.

I regret, along with other hon. members, our inability to make this retroactive. If it were possible under the Act I feel sure it would be done, but it is not possible, because the policy of our Workmen's Compensation is that the employers are assessed each year for the amount required to compensate for that particular year.

MR. SALSBERG: Could we not have legislation in that regard?

HON. MR. DALEY: If the hon. member for St. Andrew will permit me, I shall make this statement.

The employers of today, to a great extent, may not be the employers of yester year. In many cases, an employee may be drawing compensation: the employer for whom he worked may be gone, even his business may be gone. True, there are a great many still in existence, but having paid their assessment as required under the Act for the year, they feel -- and quite rightly so -- they have met their obligations.

In the last ten years we have increased the compensation considerably, and I was never one of those who would agree the employer should pay that increase, because I am not so naive as to believe the charge is not passed on to the consumer. It is a charge which is levied against him, which he pays, and at the end of that year he is finished, he has met his obligations. To go back and say to them: "Oh, yes, that was all right, but now we find in order to bring these people up to the present-day standards you are going to have to pay another $10 million or $15 million," is silly and not to be expected. As a matter of fact,

Mr. Speaker, it was recommended against by Mr. Justice Roach in that very fine report which he made. The only way these pensions or payments by the Workmen's Compensation Board could be made would be from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The taxpayer who pays his money to the Government is in no way responsible for payments to the workers; the whole amount of money received by the Workmen's Compensation Board is paid by industry. That is, to add to what I have already said, it is collected by industry and paid into the Board, so there is no way this increase could be made retroactive, as far as the Workmen's Compensation Board is concerned.

It has always seemed to me that you have two alternatives, and had we accepted the one years ago, the Workmen's Compensation would still be paying $40 to widows and 66 2/3 per cent to injured people. However, we took the other alternative, which was that from here on we go forward and increase those rates and those pensions in keeping with to-day's activities. I think that was the sensible thing to do, Mr. Speaker. I feel very sorry for people on pensions based on/of conditions years ago, but it is just the same as an insurance policy. If you bought an

effective at that
insurance policy years ago, you paid the rate/time, and the money is not worth nearly as much today, but you cannot get any retroactive feature now. If you are on a pension scheme and you become a pensioner, you do not get any retroactive feature to increase payments, because the cost of living and so forth, are up today. I feel very sorry for people who are on very small pensions, people who have had a very grievous accident, but under the Workmen's Compensation Act, there is nothing which can be done other than what we are doing, that is to constantly keep reviewing the Act to see that it is brought up-to-date and is in keeping with the conditions of the times. That is just what this Act proposes to do.

I believe that is about all the explanation required. There is a Section here which I think is reasonable. The Act provides that the monthly compensation to dependents cannot in any case exceed the average monthly earnings of the deceased worker. A man may be making $150 a month, and if there were ten children when he was killed and the widow received $75 and $250 for the children, she would be getting $300, which might encourage the elimination of some people. The

Act makes it positive that in no event will she receive more than her husband was earning, with an established minimum of $150. Before this amendment it was $100.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is a step forward in keeping this Workmen's Compensation Act to the front, and I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, just a few remarks on the principle of the Bill. It is true, and I very gladly acknowledge the fact, that our Workmen's Compensation law, and, for that matter, most of its practices, are superior to legislation in practically every other part of Canada and the United States. We acknowledge that, and we are very glad that is the case. It is so because of the continuous efforts of the trade union movement to bring about improvements in the Act itself and in its administration, With all due regard to this Government and its predecessors, I think the most credit for the improvement should go where it belongs, to the trade unions who have sponsored this, and who are continuously asking for improvement.

I would like to register my regret at the

slowness of the Government in bringing about improvements. It takes many years and much pressure to get a minimum advance. Consider, for instance, some of the improvements which are incorporated in this Bill. It is a step forward, and I am glad the Government has taken these few steps, but they are still inadequate, and I think it should be pointed out at this stage, Mr. Speaker, that some problems have remained unsolved for a long time. They are problems which I, for one, have dealt with year in and year out.

I want to draw the attention of the Government to its shortcomings at this time, particularly the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), who is sponsoring and piloting this Bill through the House, and in whose Department the Act is administered.

First, in so far as retroactivity is concerned, I think it should be made clear that there is no insurmountable barrier to the attaining of the condition of retroactivity to the families who suffer because of inflation, improved wages scales and so on. I am referring to the families whose breadwinners were injured or killed in years gone by, when the rates

were very low, and whose compensation is totally inadequate today, and they are obliged to seek assistance from either private charity or public relief organizations. That is something that hon. members supporting the Government are asking to have done away with, and I quite agree with those hon. members who, at this session and previous session, have spoken in favour of bringing about a condition which will enable the Compensation Board to raise the compensation or pensions payable to those families who are now receiving a pittance in comparison with the cost of living. It can be done.

/

(E-1 follows)

The argument that some sections of employers, or all of them, would resist or resent an effort to levy an adjustment on them now for injuries received in the past, is an objection I think we can afford to override in the interests of the people affected. It is only a formal argument, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, to say: "Well, a workman was injured in a plant but I did not know, I was not even in business at the time. Why should I be taxed for it? That is a point of view, but what I want to underline and underscore at this moment is that it is now a matter of policy. If this Government were to agree with the principle of retroactivity, that it is morally and financially justifiable, then it could be done by legislation because a workman may change his place of employment very frequently and that does not, I believe, create a situation where only the employer with whom he was employed at the time of the accident has the responsibility. All the industrial establishments, all of industry, are responsible for the victims of industrial accidents.

I think that is a sound approach to the problem, and I regret the fact that the Government has not yet adopted this viewpoint and

still adheres to the point of view it has held for so many years that it cannot pay compensation out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, would be quite prepared to agree, if the Government should not be ready to raise the adjustment, to let us pay it out of the Consolidated Revenues, because there is no question about the dire need of many families who have lost their bread winners, the head of the family, or whose breakwinner became maimed years ago, and they are now living on charity. I think we should end this matter once and for all.

I am also extremely sorry to find that the Government has not yet seen fit to implement a clause that the Commission headed by Mr. Justice Roach has recommended, and that is regarding accident prevention work. The Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) a moment ago said that Mr. Justice Roach was not in favour of a certain thing, but he was in favour of reorganizing our industrial accident prevention work, and that labour should be given a major responsibility in the carrying out of this activity, that it was essential and should be paid for out of the general fund.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the workmen immediately involved and most directly

concerned in accident prevention, because it affects their lives and their limbs, are kept outside of the entire performance of accident prevention work.

I am sorry that the Government has not yet seen fit to accept that one recommendation of Mr. Justice Roach, a recommendation, which has been made by every section of the trade unions for years and years.

There is one other point I wish to bring to the attention of the House and the Government on this occasion, and that is the special interest I have in cases of workmen who may be physically cured who are unable to resume their places in industry for psychological reasons which have developed during the time of an accident. I suggest this is a very troublesome problem in many instances and I might add that it is particularly serious with groups of foreign-born workmen, who very often find themselves alone and have language difficulties when they meet with an accident.

They do not know, very often, what is going on about them during their confinement in Hospital and then the doctors will say that they are cured and able to go to work but the workmen contend they are physically unable to work. The doctors may be right,

but the persons injured, may also be right.In so far as they are concerned, they are still unable to work. They need psychiatric assistance to overcome the difficulties that have arisen because of the accident. I suggest, as I have in years gone by, that a workman who is so disabled is as much disabled as if he had suffered a physical loss of a hand or a foot.

I am, of course, excluding the odd case which might arise of a malingering person. There may be one in ten thousand, but I have not yet come across a workman who deliberately refusedto go to work after an accident. In instances where there is this conflict between the workman and the Board or the Medical Authorities, it is a case of mental condition, shock, for many reasons, but nevertheless he is physically disabled just as much as if he had lost a finger or a hand, and it requires time and patient work with him, to lead him almost by the hand from his difficulty into complete usefulness in industry and in society.

I know we are doing a marvellous job at Malton, but that is mostly physical. We are all very proud of what is going on there but I have suggested in the past, and repeat it now -- in fact I plead with the Government -- to broaden the Malton facilities to provide for

an adequate number of psychiatrists and other specialists required to take care of those patients who after they are discharged from the Hospital by the physician as being physically cured remain incapable of going to work for reasons which are not physical and which did not exist prior to the accident.

Some of these cases are extremely pathetic. You have, as I am sure every hon. member has, had workmen come to you with their families, complaining that they are unable to go to work. They cannot raise a hand, an arm hurts, or a back is painful, and they are not malingerers. They actually feel they suffer and they are unable to go to work, and they need assistance. I am sorry that this has not yet been dealt with, in this Bill.

I take the opportunity of discussing some of these problems because I imagine this is as good a time as any during this Session to discuss compensation problems, and while joining with everyone else in appreciating and welcoming the good works the Compensation Board and its facilities give to the people of this Province, I again urge consideration of these items with which I have dealt now.

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:41 of the clock, p.m.

ONTARIO

Third Session

of the

Twenty-Fourth Legislature

of the

Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XXIII

Monday, March 16, 1953.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1953, ET SEQ.

Hon. (Rev.) M.C. Davies
Speaker.

- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Monday, March 16, 1953,
3:00 o'clock, p.m.

And the House having met.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the Commissioner of Estates Bill their report in the following cases: Bill No. 18, "an Act respecting the City of Stratford", Bill No. 23, "An Act to Dissolve Sir Henry Mill Pellatt Trust", and Bill No. 36, "An Act respecting the Town of Almonte".

CLERK ASSISTANT:

"Alec. C. Lewis, Esq., Q.C.,
Clark of the Legislative Assembly,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir: Re: Private Bill No. 18, an Act respecting the City of Stratford.

"The undersigned as Commissioners of Estate Bills as provided by the Legislative Assembly Act, R.S.O. 1950, chapter 202, section 57, having had the said Bill referred to us as such Commissioners, now beg to report thereon.

"We are of the opinion that it is reasonable that such Bill do pass into a law. We are of the further opinion that the provisions of the said Bill are proper for carrying its purpose into effect and that no alterations or amendments are necessary in the Bill.

"The Bill duly signed by the Commissioners and the Petition for the same are accordingly returned herewith.

"We have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servants,

P. E.F. Smily,

F. G. MacKay,

COMMISSIONERS OF ESTATE BILLS."

"Re: Private Bill No. 23,
An Act to dissolve the
Sir Henry Mill Pellatt Trust

The undersigned, commissioners of estate bills as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act, R.S.O. 1950, ch. 202, sec. 57, having had the said Bill referred to us as such commissioners and having heard and considered representations made to us on behalf of the petitioners for the Bill and on behalf of the Public Trustee, now beg to report thereon.

We are of the opinion that the provisions of the Bill are not proper for carrying its purposes into effect and that it is necessary that the Bill should be altered or amended as hereinafter set out. We are further of the opinion that it is reasonable that the Bill as so altered or amended do pass into a law.

The Bill submitted to us, although it provides for the dissolution of the trust and the transfer of the assets of the trust to The General Council of the Canadian Branch of the St. John Ambulance Association does not vest such assets in the said Council and we are of the opinion that a term of the Bill should provide for such vesting.

"Furthermorel the Bill does not provide for the passing or audit of the accounts in connectioj with the trust as is the ordinary and usual provision when trustees are relieved of their duties with respect to a trust and we are of the opinion that such provision should be included in the Bill.

"We hereby submit the amendments to the Bill which, in our opinion, are proper and necessary in order to carry its purposes into effect. In the place and stead of sections 1 to 3 inclusive of the Bill, the following sections should be substituted:

"1. (1) The Trustees shall, as soon as conveniently may be after this Act comes into force, bring in and pass before a Judge of the Surrogate Court of the County of Carleton, their accounts in connection with the Trust established by the Indenture dated the 25th day of May, 1933, between Major General Sir Henry Mill Pellatt, Kt., C.V.O., D.C.L. as donor and Major General John Taylor Fotheringham, C.M.G., M.D.C.M., Colonel Henry Brock and Charles Joseph Copp, M.D.C.M., as Trustees.

"The provisions of The Trustee Act shall apply on such passing of accounts.

"Upon such passing of accounts, the assets forming the corpus of the said Trust and any balance of moneys remaining in the hands of the Trust ees as found by the Surrogate Court Judge on such passing shall be transferred by the Trustees to the General Council of the Canadian Branch of the St. John Ambulance Association and on such transfer the said Trust shall be and it is hereby declared to be dissolved and all assets forming the corpus of the said Trust shall be vested in the said The General Council of the Canadian Branch of the St. John Ambulance Association.

"Upon such transfer the Trustees shall be discharged from any further duties as such and shall be relieved of any liability incurred by them in respect of any act or thing done or omitted to be done by them or any of them in their capacity as

Trustees of the said Trust.

"The Petition and the Bill as submitted to us are returned herewith.

"We have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servants,

F. D. Hogg ,

R. I. Ferguson

Commissioners of Estate Bills."

"Re: Private Bill No. 36, an Act Respecting the Town of Almonte

"The undersigned as Commissioners of Estate Bills as provided by the Legislative Assembly Act, R.S.O. 1950, chapter 202, section 57, having had the said Bill referred to us as such Commissioners, now beg to report thereon.

"We are of the opinion that the Legislature has the power to enact such a Bill and it appearing that its provisions do not offend the intentions of the testatrix as expressed in the words "to construct, establish and maintain a public park or recreation ground" but rather are of an assistance in such being more adequately carried out, we are further of the opinion that it is reasonable that the Bill be passed into law. We are also of the opinion that the provisions of the said Bill are proper for carrying its purpose into effect and that no alterations or amendments are necessary in the Bill.

"The Bill duly signed by the Commissioners and the Petition for the same are accordingly returned herewith.

"We have the honour to be

Sir,

Your obedient servants,

P.E.F. Smily
F.G. MacKay,
Commissioners of Estate Bills."

MR. SPEAKER presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports: Reports of the Forest Resources Inventory covering the following districts, Algonquin, North Bay, Timiskaming, Cochrane, Kapuskasing, Geraldton, Port Arthur, Sudbury and White River.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

> "Notwithstanding any application which Rules 8, 9, and 14 may have to this motion any Minister of the Crown, when presenting his estimates to the House, may occupy a seat in the front row of the House and may have his deputy Minister and another member of his staff seated in front of or adjacent to him to supply information required by the Minister. The same order will apply to the discussion on Bill 80 when being considered in Committee of the Whole House."

Motion agreed to. He said:

The purpose of this motion re the estimates to follow the practice last year of having the Deputy Minister, or other officials, present so that the information may be more readily available to the House instead of sending notes to the side lines to get it.

In connection with the consideration of Bill No. 80, which is a statute referring to a great many other statutes, we would like to have the

Solicitor for the Department who has handled the drafting of the Bill, and knows the relations of the various sections, sit adjacent to the hon.Ministers s information can be given to the hon.members if they require it relative to the sections of this Bill in relation to Statutes, etc. I think it would facilitate matters very much if that were done.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. WELLAND S. GEMMELL (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, with your permission before the Orders of the Day, in view of the fact that we are submitting today a large share of the forest inventory, I would like to make a few comments.

As the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) has told the House, the inventory reports that are tabled today include the following districts: North Bay, Timiskaming, Cochrane, Kapuskasing, Geraldton, Port Arthur, Algonquin, Parry Sound, Sudbury, and White River. In tabling these reports I would point out that each is a separate summary for the district concerned.

The complete data and notes upon which they are based are very voluminous. This data is stored with the Forest Resources Inventory material in the Department's records where they are available for the inspection of Members at any time.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the Committee on Lands and Forests meets we will be able to have the hon. members visit the particular department where this work is done and give a complete explanation to the hon.members as to the work of that Department.

The reports tabled are in the process of being printed and should be ready, barring unforeseen printing delays, at the end of the fiscal year.

In the matter of detailed information the reports will be found to be extremely comprehensive, more or less technical, but decidedly informative. Their completion on schedule is a matter of gratification and pride to the Department.

While these are the individual district reports I would like, before proceeding to a further discussion of the results obtained, to summarize the physical accomplishments from the inventory.

(1) The total area photographed was 105,600,000 acres.

(2) In order to completely cover this extensive area, some 150,000 photos were taken. These are all in our possession.

(3) From the photos taken, 215,000 prints were made. Of this number 140,000 have been distributed to industry and interested individuals while 75,000 were for the use of

the Government.

(4) Base maps made from the photographs totalled 1600.

(5) Forest Type Maps made from the Base maps numbered 1600.

(6) The total area of ground cruised by the Government was 54,400,000 acres.

(7) Ground cruises by industry totalled 51,200,000 acres.

From the air and ground surveys we get these results:

Total area surveyed 105,600,000 acres of which:

Forest Lands totalled 81,280,000 acres

Waste Land totalled 24,320,000 acres

Of the Forest land - 72,320,000 acres or 89 per cent is Crown Land, and 8,960,000 acres or 11 per cent is Private Land.

The makeup of the Forest surveyed is:

Mature area - 46%
Immature area 32%
Young growth 14%
Seedlings 8%

This great undertaking has been a joint effort on the part of government and industry. The area under concession agreements or licences to industry totals 56,812,800 acres. Of this amount 51,200,000 acres have been cruised by the companies concerned, and plans for the long-range management of these areas have already been

submitted to the government, or will be within the next few months.

The actual status of these plans is as follows:

80 Companies are required to submit 103 plans covering 56,812,800 acres.

53 Plans have been received covering 33,484,800 acres.

10 Plans are overdue, covering 10,858,280 acres.

32 Plans are due March 31, 1953, covering 4,225,280 acres.

8 Plans are due after March 31, 1953 covering 8,244,480 acres.

Disposition of Plans:

Of the 53 Plans already received 13 covering 10,204,160 acres have not yet been analyzed.
32 covering 18,945,920 acres have been analyzed but not yet approved.
8 covering 4,334,720 acres have been approved.

The basic requirement of sound forest management is a complete knowledge of all the details of the forest property, including such factors as the locations and stands of all merchantable timber by species and quantities, the growth rate of each species and the annual allowable cut on a sustained yield basis. The latter is the objective of all properly directed effort in forest crop production, because it is

designed to ensure continuous revenues from the forest lands, as well as providing that the wood-using industries will have at their disposal a perpetual supply of raw materials.

Aircraft were used by the Department of Lands and Forests as early as 1921 for forest inventory purposes. This was accomplished by aerial sketching, which was the forerunner of aerial photography and still occupies an important place in forest inventory work.

Ground surveys are extensively carried on of course, but due to the tremendous areas involved, difficulties of transportation and the limitations of time, the results were not comprehensive enough to provide a complete and detailed inventory.

The first aerial photographs for mapping and inventory purposes were taken by the Department in 1926. During the following twenty years the technique of securing a forest inventory by the aerial photographic method was gradually perfected in the aerial survey section of the Department, which took full advantage of the research work carried out in Canada and elsewhere. By the end of the second world war the Department had fully developed its own technique methods.

In 1946 a start was made on a complete survey of the forest resources of the Province, with the object of providing entirely new and up-to-date

forest maps and timber volumes, as well as a basis for placing the forest resources under sustained yield forest management.

MAPS:

In the process of completing the inventory, an entirely new map of the Province has been provided. The 1600 base or planimetric maps used in making the type maps are masterpieces of detail and general information, and of great use and value to all Departments of the Ontario Government. For example, they provide a clear picture of our land and recreational areas, and will be most helpful in planning developments in these areas. All ground features are shown on these maps - lakes, rivers, streams, roads and so forth - and thus their value in connection with fish and wildlife management will be obvious. From them the public will be able to secure specific information concerning the geographic and topographic features of any area for which maps are available.

The maps which show in detail the lakes, drainage systems and watersheds have helped Hydro-Electric to determine the amount of electrical energy that may be developed at potential sites and the storage reservoirs that may be created.

PHOTOS:

While the mapping program was undertaken to obtain an inventory of the timber resources of the Province, another feature of importance

has been developed. Mosaics have been made from aerial photographs of high quality showing the lakes and other water areas easily accessible by road. These are extensively used in the disposition of Crown Lands as locations for summer cottages and tourist resort camps. Cities have also obtained masaics of enlargements from negatives to be used for planning and development purposes.

The photographs have proven invaluable to the Department of Highways in helping to determine the location of the Trans-Canada Highway through the rugged pre-Cambrian shield with its innumerable lakes, drainage courses, swamps and rock escarpments formidable to road building. Study plans are prepared of large areas covering all possible location routes and showing soil, swamp and rock classifications as well as the rock escarpment. Close examination of the more favorable areas on the aerial photographs suggest the best locations, and these are then established and marked on the completed study plans.

Many Ontario surveyors are acquiring libraries of thephotographs of the area where their work is located. From these photographs necessary work may be planned and estimates made of the difficulties that may be encountered and the probable time required to do the job. Possession of the photographs makes it easier

for a client to explain clearly what work is to be performed; and they are particularly useful in discussing drainage problems.

Many of the older surveys in sparsely settled sections of the Province which have become obliterated through lumbering operations and forest fires, have been re-established by careful examination of the photographs and comparison with the field notes of the former survey.

GROUND SURVEYS:

It is important to point out that in addition to the aerial photographic survey, all of the area so covered has also been surveyed from the ground. The photographic method has taken much of the drudgery out of the ground work only, and has transformed forest survey work into a highly skilled specialized undertaking. A resume of the working methods will probably be of interest.

Tne field work is carried out by crews of six men. The technical staff of each crew includes a graduate forester as party chief, a third year forestry student with usually two seasons' experience, and a second year student with one year's experience. The field supervisors have four crews to look after, and the whole is under the direction of the general supervisor. Each crew covers during a summer from 1500 to 2000 square miles.

Each crew takes with it the preliminary forest type map, prepared during the winter, and the aerial photographs of the area to be worked over. The most important work of the field crews is the measurement of the forest growth or sample plots.

Travel and transportation of field parties from point to point are as varied as the difficulties of the terrain dictate, and extend all the way from the most modern movement by aircraft down to the most primitive foot slogging. The use of aircraft for transport of personnel has permitted a much wider sample plot distribution, which is fundamental to the success of the sample plot method of inventory.

When the crews return from the field in September, work is resumed in the preparation of the finished type maps, which are handed over to the drafting department for making of the final tracings and plans. Compilation crew work out the merchantable volume figures, growth and yield, and other data, and assemble them into systematic tabular form.

T he tabular statements accompanying the Forest Resources Inventory show the volume of timber by species, types and age classes in such a way that the total volume of merchantable and other timber in a township, watershed, district, or in the province as a whole, can be

readily obtained.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the House that this Inventory is a very valuable and historic document, and one of which the Province of Ontario should be extremely proud. It is the most advanced and comprehensive survey of its kind ever undertaken by any State or Government. In essence, it is the culmination of several years of painstaking effort and study to finalize the development and planning of a sound policy of forest management in Ontario. The 150,000 photographs will form a permanent record of this Province as it is at this time, from a physical standpoint, while the data assembled will be of inestimable value as a guide in future management plans.

For the first time it is possible to assess and value the available forest resources of this great Province, and maintain a perpetual inventory for the use and benefit of this and future generations.

(B follows)

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, there is a matter of some public importance upon which I wish to make some comment. It is in respect to the case of Ronald Power, who was charged with armed robbery, at the trial was found guilty, and later, as the result of a new trial, was acquitted.

There has been some comment in the Press from time to time about this case, and the suggestion has been put forward on different occasions that this man is entitled to some compensation for being kept in custody as long as he was, and because it was a case of mistaken identity.

There was an article in "Saturday Night", dated March 14th, 1953, which goes considerably farther than the other articles, and I think it is desirable I should make a complete statement with respect to what happened in this case.

The "Saturday Night", on the first page, puts an editorial in the form of a letter to Mr. Power, and says:

> " We know that this letter to you in no way makes up for the seven months you spent in prison for a crime you did not commit, but we wanted you to understand that not all your fellow men are so lacking in conscience that

they can let you go your way with a bland 'so sorry.'

There are many of us who feel shamed by the neverless way in which Attorney-General Porter of Ontario hid behind existing law when he said there was no provision for compensation in such cases as yours, and added that it was a matter for the federal authorities. Of course it is a matter for the federal authorities; but it is just as much the concern of the Attorney-General of Ontario, and of every person appointed to administer justice and of every man and woman who has the right to expect justice within and without the law.

The Attorney-General failed to meet the demands of his office when he shrugged off your case. He would have been doing his job properly if he had declared: 'You, an innocent man, have been unjustly imprisoned. The state has taken away from you seven months of your life; it has deprived you of your liberty, your work and your good name. For this grievous offence against you, the state must make proper amends.'

Then Attorney-General Porter should have said: 'I propose to take immediate action to see that you are compensated for your losses, as far as it is possible to compensate an innocent man for the mental and physical indignities of appearing as an accused person, being found guilty of a crime he did not commit, and being held prisoner for months in a jail. In your case, the state is guilty and the state must pay; and the law must be so adjusted that in future there will be no question of the state's obligation in such a matter.'

But the Attorney-General did not make any such statement. He evaded his responsibility and pushed it on to somebody else, and because of that all of us must carry some shame. The law moves ponderously and each step costs money; it may be that you would rather forget about this injustice than start the expensive process of testing the conscience of the law. But we cannot forget about it, because your case can be repeated in the years to come and we are not cynical enough to say, 'Well, it doesn't happen often.' Once is too often.

We believe the law must be changed now, so that a man unjustly imprisoned can get immediate compensation from the state (or the Crown or whatever name we use) for its offence against him, without having to go through a long and costly legal process. The state, according to its present laws, condones its own offence. This injustice cannot be tolerated. The state must say: 'We have erred. For this we will pay you all the money you would have earned if you had not been in prison; we will see that you are properly employed; we will also fine ourselves, and pay you that fine, in an effort to compensate you for the indignity we made you suffer.'"

Finally, in the last paragraph, it says:

" So do not judge all of us by the action of the Attorney-General of Ontario. There are many of us who believe that law is not something which gives a politician protective coloring, but a force to be used for the greater good of the community and all the individuals who make up the community."

Mr. Speaker, this case occurred in the city of Toronto sometime in April, 1952. A man was driving his car along the street and wished to be directed to a place where he wanted to go, and he asked two men on the side of the road whether they could inform him as to the proper way to travel to get to his destination, and they said, "We will get into your car with you, and we will direct you to the place you wish to go."

One of these men, by the name of Nugent, was later charged and convicted. The other was at first thought to be Power. At any rate, as they proceeded, one man produced a revolver, pointed it at the driver, held him up, and took what money he had upon him

As it happened, some of the money was in the form of American bills, and it turned out they were traceable. It was finally found that Nugent had the bills on his person, as the result of the detective work done by the police. So Nugent was charged with the offence of armed robbery. Power, who was associated with Nugent at that time, and was found in his company, was brought for questioning into the police station. Power, in order at that time to assist Nugent in his case, gave a statement to the police to the effect that he and Nugent had been together on the night in question at another place entirely, and

remained all night. That was his means of supporting the alibi which was intended to be put forward by Nugent at that timo.

On this same occasion, when these two men were in the police station, the complainant in this case, the driver of the motor car, came into the police station and identified him as the second man who was in his car. Therefore, a joint charge was laid against both Nugent and Power for armed robbery. When this happened, Power then made a second statement to the police, different from the first, in which he admitted he was not out with Nugent on the night in question, and he disclaimed all responsibility for being in his company. So there were two inconsistent statements from this man, and a charge was laid, and the case proceeded.

The offence occurred on the 12th of April, 1952; Power was arrested on Monday, the 14th of April of the same year, and was tried by His Honour Judge Forsyth without a jury on June 3rd, and sentenced to five years in the penitentiary.

At the trial, all this evidence was brought forth, both statements which had been made by Power were adduced in evidence, the Court had the benefit of all evidence which was available at that time, and the complainant in the case, quite bona fide, and

acting honestly, thought that Power was the second man in his car, and he swore to that effect at the trial.

A Notice of Appeal was served on the 3rd day of July, 30 days later, which was the last day on which a Notice may be filed. It is interesting to note that pending the Appeal, no application was made for bail. Up to this time, this man was in custody as a result of the charge of armed robbery, a very serious offence, and as happens in all cases when a man is charged with an indictable offence, he is arrested and must apply to the Court for bail if he wishes to be free pending the trial. In this case, in the first instance, no bail was granted, and I am not quite sure whether it was even applied for. But when the Appeal Notice was filed, there was no application for bail, which he was entitled to make if he wished to be out of custody during that time.

The evidence taken at the trial was finally delivered on November 14th and the case came up in the Court of Appeal on December 11th, 1952. By that time, as the result of the activities of the police, and in particular of one Inspector Kennedy, some further information was obtained about another man by the name of Cass Martin, and it was found that Power was not the guilty person, and that he was not in the car of

the complainant with Nugent, but it was Martin, another man. This evidence was available at the time of the hearing of the Appeal in December, 1952.

As a result of the Appeal,a new trial was directed by the Court of Appeal, and the case came up again for trial on the 12th of February, 1953, and with the new evidence which was available at that time, the result was he was acquitted and went free.

He was not on bail at any time pending the re-trial, in spite of the fact that the Crown Attorney told his counsel he would approve of bail. However, no application was made.

Mr. Speaker, this particular man at no time during that period was serving a term as the result of any conviction; he was in custody throughout awaiting trial.

This happens in a great many criminal cases. In a case of murder, there is no opportunity for bail at all, there are many cases where men accused of murder are acquitted as a result of the trial, but it has never been suggested, I do not think, that because a person is acquitted, because the evidence at the trial is found to be insufficient to support a charge, or the evidence put forward by the defence is sufficient to refute the charge, there should be any justification for the taxpayers compensating every

person who happens to be held in custody pending trial.

This case is no different from the others. As a matter of fact, in this case it would seem it was through Power's misstatement deliberately made to the police in the early stages, and the finding that the statement was untrue, which perhaps cast some suspicion upon his movements, and his conduct. As it turns out, Power, in appearance, was quite similar to Martin, who eventually was found to be the man actually in the motor car.

Mr. Speaker, that is a case where there turned out to be mistaken identity, but in criminal cases, there are various issues and when a person is charged with a crime, it may turn out he committed some act which was thought to be a crime, but by the time the evidence is all in, it may be found that his act was in self-defence, or he has been proven innocent, and yet it has never been suggested and has never been the practice in cases of that kind to compensate men merely because they were charged and acquitted.

There have been some exceptional cases in England, notably one case where a man was convicted of obtaining money by false pretences in a certain way and he served his full term -- a number of years -- in the penitentiary. He was released, and was again charged with the same type of offence, and began to

serve another term, until it was suddenly discovered that someone else was committing this series of crimes. In that case, the Home Secretary recommended compensation because of the long period in custody the man had served after conviction. That was done as a very special act of grace on the part of the Crown in that case, and for that reason.

But this case is no different from the ordinary run of cases which are coming up all the time in the Courts. This man was finally acquitted, and during the time he spent in custody he could have been free on bail if he had applied for it.

It is rather extraordinary that another case which arose quite recently occurred where there was mistaken identity. That was the case of Regina versus Boyd. Norman Boyd was tried for bank robbery before His Honour Judge Forsyth and a Jury some months ago. This was another case of mistaken identity, but it was a much stronger case of mistaken identity, because the evidence at the trial turned out to be so weak that the Judge wrote a report which was forwarded to the Court of Appeal in which he said he disagreed with the finding of the Jury, and gave his reasons for doing so. Finally, when the hearing came before the Court of Appeal, the Court of Appeal quashed the conviction. I do not know, Mr. Speaker,

that anybody has felt so strongly about the Boyd case, a stronger case than the Power case.

But even there the same custom and the same practice follows, When a person is charged with a serious offence, the State is posed with this problem. In the first place, society must be protected, because if this man were guilty of bank robbery or armed robbery, society is endangered by his presence. So, as I say, the first thing which must be done is to keep him in custody to see whether he is guilty or not. The charge is laid on the best evidence available in its early stages. The protection of society is the first problem.

The second viewpoint which must also always be considered is fairness to the accused. I do not think in our administration of justice in this province, in the Courts as they are constituted, there are very many cases over the many years we have carried on in this province where any serious injustice was done to an accused person. As a matter of fact, everything is done to give the accused every possible chance which could be given to take advantage of the very best defence which might be open to him, so he will not be convicted if there is any doubt whatsoever.

In this case, I think the Power case is

just one more instance of the way in which justice was finally done, and the interesting part of it is that as far as Power himself was concerned, he was the one who caused the suspicion to fall upon him by giving two inconsistent statements to the police, and being associated so deeply with Nugent that he wanted to support his alibi. It was the police who discovered the evidence which finally resulted in his acquittal.

In indicating what the facts were in this case, I would suggest that some of these statements in "Saturday Night", are, to say the least, a bit extreme.

There is just one other point I wish to mention in connection with the administration of justice. Last week a coroner's jury, after hearing the evidence with respect to a roadblock which was set up on the Queen Elizabeth Highway, commended the police very highly for the work they did, for the presence of mind they showed, for the promptness with which they acted, and that they used their judgment under the circumstances in the best possible way, and the jury recommended that roadblocks, as a practice, be not discontinued.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

BILL NO. 80

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 80, "An Act to provide for the Federation of the Municipalities in the Toronto-Metropolitan Area for Certain Financial and other Purposes," Mr. Frost (Victoria).

Section 1; subsections (a) to (o) inclusive agreed to.

(TAKE C FOLLOWS)

On section 2:

MR. SALSBERG: Section 2 of the Bill is really a very crucial section in that it incorporates a number of evils in a short few lines.

Firstly, section 2, would clear the way for an unelected type of council which is not directly elected, and, secondly, it would do away with the proposal and, I should say, widespread request for a plebiscite on the entire question, in so far as this section very clearly establishes a date when the proposed metropolitan area shall be constituted into a municipality of a new sort, and I think the issue of the rights of the people to vote on Bill No. 80, or, for that matter on any proposed amalgamation or unification scheme, should be heard.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member for St. Andrew please direct himself to the section involved which is purely regarding the name of the proposed corporation, and speak to that subject.

MR. SALSBERG: I wish to point out to the Chairman at the present stage of this discussion of this or any other Bill, he should give himself a chance to acclimatize himself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you please speak to Section No. 2.

MR. SALSBERG: I am speaking on Section

No. 2, and will you please give me a chance to explain it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sit down. You are out of order.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not going to be gagged here by you.

HON. MR. FROST: My hon. friend raises two points there. First, the elective nature of the council. I would point out to the hon. member that is a point which he is entitled to attack, but that comes up in the section dealing with the council itself.

The other point he raises concerns the plebiscite. I think that matter was determined on second reading of the Bill. Surely that was passed at that time. However I would say if that matter does arise, I think it would come up under a different section.

I want to say to the hon. member, and, indeed to all hon. members of the House, regarding these sections, there are a large number of amendments and there are a large number of proposed changes which will be brought forward by hon. members of the House. I do not think there is any intention of confining the hon. member. I think he will have the opportunity of speaking on any of these things he has in mind

in connection with sections of the Act. I do not think we want to go into second reading again and discuss all of the matters of principle which we have passed.

Our position is that the House has approved the principle of the Bill, and it is now a question of getting down to detail and making this Act work, and if there are places where it does not work, then I think our job here in committee is to deal with these points. I point that out to the hon. member.

MR. SALSBERG: I am very glad the hon. Prime Minister made those remarks. I agree with most of them quite fully. I want to point out, however, that I think an amendment to section 2 should be made and I want to lead up to the proposal of the amendment. I can move it first and discuss it later.

HON. MR. FROST: Let us have your amendment.

MR. SALSBERG: But the Chairman, should, of course, understand there is quite a bit of leeway given members when discussing a Bill of this importance in committee stage. I agree that in principle this Bill was given second reading, but as far as this one member of the House is concerned, I am within my rights in fighting against this Bill by way of a rear-guard

action, and I will continue to do it until there will be no more chance to do so.

We do not have to fly at each other's throats, but that is my position, and I am going to do it, and I am speaking on this section.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you please present your amendment.

MR. SALSBERG: I will, as soon as I am ready. I will be ready in a moment, but you must accord me the right --

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you please sit down again.

MR. SALSBERG: I will, but I will rise again, I assure you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 2 is now being called, and if you have an amendment please present it.

MR. SALSBERG: I am on section 2 and I have an amendment, but I want to point out for the sake of procedure that even if I had no amendment I could rise and discuss this clause. Let us get this clear for the sake of procedure in this House in committee stage on this or any other Bill. I have also been in this House for a good many years and I say I have never heard of the proposed procedure, and I am sure the hon. members on the Treasury benches will agree with me.

My amendment is as follows and I will

elaborate on it now but I can introduce it later.

THE CHAIRMAN: Introduce it and stop talking.

MR. SALSBERG: I will introduce it when I am ready, as long as I am following the rules, and you are not going to alter the rules as far as I am concerned:

> "I move that all words in sub-section 1 of section 2 be deleted and the following words to be inserted in their stead:
>
> "If the citizens of the Metropolitan area who are entitled to the franchise shall by a majority vote in a special plebiscite favour the provisions of this Act, then the inhabitants of the Metropolitan Area shall within two months of such a plebiscite be constituted a body corporate under the name of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto."

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the meaning of this amendment is quite obvious. Instead of agreeing to the establishment of this union of municipalities by approving the section without having given the people a chance to vote, the amendment proposes that if the people in a plebiscite shall by a majority vote approve the contents of this

Act, then the new Area should come into being within two months of the holding of such a plebiscite.

There is a convenient difference between what I propose and what is contained in the Bill and I appeal to all members of the House to support this amendment. It may be defeated in committee stage. I hope it will not. But I think it is significant and also necessary that a stand be taken on this question and I say to all members of the House for them to refuse a vote of the people to express their view on this question is wrong, and they should support this amendment.

Amendment negatived.

(Page C-7 follows)

MR. SALSBERG: You are denying a vote to the people; ramming it down their throats.

Section 2 agreed to.

Subsections 1 and 2 of section 3 agreed to.

On subsection 3 of section 3.

MR. OLIVER: I would like the hon. Prime Minister to note the language. It says:

> "A by-law passed by the Metropolitan Council in the exercise of any of its powers and in good faith shall not be open to question, or be quashed, set aside or declared invalid either wholly or partly on account of the unreasonableness or supposed unreasonableness of its provisions or any of them."

I think, Mr. Chairman, this is tantamount to saying that no Bill passed by the Metropolitan Council is subject to appeal no matter how objectionable that appeal might be in the eyes of many people.

The Council, according to my reading of that subsection, is given absolute power and can force its will in somewhat of a dictatorial fashion over any part or parts of the Area involved.

The imposition of substantial money by-laws of any area or group within the Metropolitan Area would leave the municipalities, I suggest to the House, without recourse to the Municipal Board or any other board of appeal. I doubt very much if we want to go that far.

HON. MR. FROST: I might say to the hon. member that this section -- I was going to say "unreasonable as it may be"-- is taken from the Municipal Act. It is a provision which applies to all municipalities in Ontario. It is not a new section nor is it new law. It is law which has been in force, I suppose, for seventy-five years and comes into this section of this Act following the provisions of the MunicipalAct.

In discussing the matter here briefly with the Solicitor,I think the matter relates to the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the by-law, but if for any reason outside of the question of reasonableness, the matter subject to determination by the courtsas to its validity,oras to the power to pass a certain by-law, and so on, is not covered here. This deals with the limited matter which isshown in the last line of the section.

I think there is no reason why, in connection with by-laws this body is entitled or empowered to pass,that it should not have the same powers and the same technical background as have by-laws passed by any municipality under the authority of the Municipal Act.

MR. OLIVER: Why would there not be a right to appeal,

HON. MR. PORTER: If this were not passed

in this form then anybody who questioned a by-law because he thought that it was unreasonable, because he thought it was not a sensible by-law, could go to the courts, and the purpose of this is a protection against that sort of thing. Once a council is given certain power, it has the right to exercise those powers and it cannot be open to question just because someone does not agree with it and thinks it is silly or unreasonable. I do not know what would happen if the powers of this legislature were questioned, or if any law was open to question because someone did not think it was reasonable. It would be impossible to carry on business because the hon. members on the other side of the House do not think anything we do is reasonable.

MR. OLIVER: Their powers under this section are non-existent so far as appeal is concerned. It does not matter what the issue is, it does not matter if a large number of people believe they should appeal, there is not a chance of appealing. They are a law unto themselves completely.

HON. MR. PORTER: Section 15 of the Bill makes certain sections of the Municipal Act applicable to the Metropolitan corporation, and that includes sections relating to appeal

MR. OLIVER: Then there is a right of appeal?

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes, that is covered in the same way it is with ordinary municipalities.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, I presume the Municipal Board will have jurisdiction over some of the by-laws passed by the Metropolitan Area, the same as the jurisdiction of the local council.

MR. SALSBERG: Does this mean that one of the affected municipalities will not have the right to appeal against the by-law to the Municipal Board, because when the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) spoke, I think he was referring to individuals. Does that apply also to member municipalities that they, too, will be denied the right to appeal what they consider to be an unreasonable by-law?

HON.MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member has had experience in a City Council. When the City Council passes a by-law, it is passed by the majority of the Council. He might think it was unreasonable but would the hon. member think that the Council should stop there and not pass the by-law because one person thought it was unreasonable? Here in this set-up of the Metropolitan Area the municipalities are different. Any municipality can object, they have a representative

there and any municipality can appeal. The municipality may appeal to the Municipal Board if they are not satisfied with the actions of the Council, but so far as an appeal is concerned, it is just handled the same way it would be in a county council or city council: the majority rules.

MR. SALSBERG: To the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, the explanation sounds reasonable when it is applied to an individual council and to council members, but I suggest that if this new Metropolitan Council will be established bringing together so many separate municipalities, it is a bit hard and a bit unreasonable, I think, to deprive an entire municipal government from appealing a by-law which may carry by majority vote in the Metropolitan Council.

HON. MR. PORTER: Any of the Municipal Councils in that area can apply just as any ratepayer can to raise the question of the validity of the by-law, but they cannot do it just on the ground or for the reason they might think in their own minds it is unreasonable, or because they disagree with the principle of it, or object for any other reason, to the validity of the by-law or the power to pass that by-law. The Municipal Council can do the same thing as any ratepayer. Is that the point your raised?

MR. SALSBERG: I appreciate the answer.

but what I am trying to say --

HON. MR. PORTER: Has your question been answered or not?

MR. SALSBERG: No, because you stressed the validity and the legal basis of any by-law which may be questioned. What I am trying to suggest to the government is that in the initial stage of the establishment of the supreme Council for that area it is conceivable that an affected municipality, one of the thirteen, may feel it is unreasonable --

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member wants to give each municipality the power to veto.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not going to be confused by the words of the hon. Attorney General. He used the term "veto".

HON. MR. PORTER: Is that not right?

MR. SALSBERG: The veto which is employed by another agency in the world was proposed by the then President of the United States.

HON. MR. PORTER: It has been exercised by certain other people in the world.

MR. SALSBERG: That is their right. The proposal, however, came from the President of the United States.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are on subsection 3 of section 3.

MR. SALSBERG: I am pursuing the subsection. Please do not try to hurry me. What I suggest

to the Government is that in a case of this kind - it is not wrong to allow municipal governments to appeal to the Municipal Board against a by-law which, in their opinion, is unreasonable.

HON. MR. FROST: My friend is quite wrong about that.

MR. SALSBERG: For instance, if Scarborough should feel that the adoption of a certain by-law is extremely unreasonable as far as they are concerned, surely we could allow them to go to the Municip al Board and make their appeal against the By-law because of its unreasonableness, and I do not see any reason why we should not grant them that right. Call it "veto", call it what you like; I am not suggesting they be given the right to veto it, but the right of appeal should not be taken away from them in respect to local grants or the legal validity of a by-law. I suggest that is too narrow.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: In other words you feel the majority of the council,elected as it is, would be unreasonable, that they would not deal in a reasonable way with any by-law. That is what you are saying. In other words, you have not faith in the majority of the members of this Council which is going to be elected; that they would be unreasonable and override the minority in the Council. That does not happen very often.

MR. SALSBERG: In reply to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs I want to admit that I do not have the faith one should have in this Council because this Council will not be a directly-elected one. You have just voted against an amendment of mine and you will have an appointed chairman and an indirectly-elected Council, and because of that I think every precaution should be taken by the municipalities and their separate governments, to protect what they may consider to be the best interests of their municipalities. If you were to have an elected man, it would be different, but you are appointing him, and I think the affected municipality should have the right to appeal what they may consider to be an unreasonable by-law.

MR. OLIVER: I want to say a word on sub-section 3 again, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to hear the hon. Attorney General on this because he can perhaps straighten the argument out so that it will be understandable to all of us. I have not had the benefit of legal training my friend has and I appreciate the difficulties of really getting to the bottom of this question, but it seems to me that section 3 provides the authority to override and render inoperative the ordinary provision of the Municipal Act which allows appeals to the Municipal Board.

Either section 3 is not necessary there at all, or else it means that the provisions of the Municipal Act can be overcome and can be rendered inoperative and I would like to hear my friend on that.

HON. MR. PORTER: I see there is still some misapprehension as to the scope of sub-section 3.

As I pointed out, in Section 15 of the Bill there are a number of sections of the Municipal Act which are applied to this Metropolitan Corporation, and you will notice that Sections 291 to 296 apply. Beginning at section 292 you have Part XI of the Municipal Act entitled "Quashing By-Laws". The same procedure not only is open to any of the qualified persons who wish to question the validity of any by-law on any other ground except the ground of unreasonableness but is open to any municipality under Part XI of the Municipal Act.

In this part, section 295:

> "Where it is alleged that a by-law injuriously affects another municipality or any ratepayer of it, and that the by-law is illegal in whole or in part, the corporation of such other municipality or any ratepayer of it may apply to quash the by-law."

This would give the same right to the various constituencies and municipalities of this area.

MR. OLIVER: That can still be done, in

spite of subsection 3.

HON. MR. PORTER: Yes. All this did was to carry forward the principle which applies to any municipality that no ratepayer can come forward just because he disagrees with the policy of a by-law and think it is unreasonable, and then ask the court or the Municipal Board to say whether the Council acted reasonably or not. I am sure the hon. member would agree it would not be in the best interest of municipal autonomy to place their by-laws before some tribunal of that kind, to decide whether they were acting wisely or not in any given case. I am sure we are in agreement on that point. I think the hon. member has spoken many times about the powers of the Municipal Board and the autonomy of the municipalities, but if any by-law anybody thought was unreasonable or who did not agree with it in principle, should not be able to bring the matter before a court or before the Municipal Board and say, "I do not like this by-law because it is not right, it is not sensible. I do not think it is good policy, it is unreasonable." I think the Council has complete power to enact this. Then, of course, I would think there would be such a multiplicity of actions from various people that it would be impossible to carry on the work of Council.

MR. GRUMMETT: I can appreciate the attitude taken by the hon. Leader of the Opposition , and

I can see his fear and I was wondering if it might not be possible to have this section held and redrafted in a little different way which would set out exactly what the hon. Attorney General is explaining.

HON. MR. FROST: This section is just taken holus bolus from the other Act and the part that really counts is the two last lines:

> "On account of the unreasonableness or supposed unreasonableness of its provisions or any of them"

Perhaps I could give you an example. This example will not apply to the Metropolitan Council, but supposing this Legislature gives to a municipality the power to put parking meters on the streets, and the municipality proceeds to act on that authority, then a ratepayer is entitled to appeal and take action against the Council in connection with its power to do that, but the same ratepayer is not entitled to question the reason for the municipality putting parking meters there if the power is in the Act. That is the meaning of it and it simply draws the line at this point, that if the power is given to the municipality to do certain things then it is not open for anybody to appeal on the ground that it is unrasonable or reasonable to do these things. That is the purpose of the section. In other words, the limitation that is in the section is the same limitation that is in the

Municipal Act and it does not prevent any person, any one of the constituent municipalities, from disputing the right, or the power, of the central municipality to do a certain thing, but you cannot go behind it and say it is bad policy. That is the meaning of this section.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4.

MR. YAREMKO: In speaking to section 4 of the Bill, I think perhaps this is something that may be regarded as a minor amendment. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in speaking on the second reading I said the following:

> "Having recognized the broad principles of the Bill, my chief concern has been to see that the provisions will be fair to all, as far as we can possibly make them, and that everything possible be done for the smooth and efficient working of the Council for the benefit of all the people. That is my concern, and I am sure it has been the concern of every hon. member for Toronto and the Yorks, and also has been the concern of this Government."

(D follows)

Mr. Chairman, that concern has been evidenced by the fact that the various Toronto and York members have been in continual session since this Bill was introduced, discussing it section by section. The results of their meeting will be shown during this Committee stage, and it has been a privilege for me to sit with these hon. members in connection with suggested amendments to various sections because I, for one, happen to be the only one, with one other exception, who has at any time had the privilege of serving on a city Council, or otherwise, and certainly the information I have gleaned from the various hon.members for Toronto and the Yorks, has been great in regard to all sections of the Bill. In fact, we have been dealing, Mr. Chairman,with these sections on the basis already as a Metropolitan Council with an area conception, and certainly, as far as I am concerned, I think this Committee will discover as we proceed, that their concern has been very minute indeed, as exemplified by the fact that I am moving the following amendment:

> "That subsection 7 of Section 4 be amended by inserting after the word 'preside' in the first line, the words 'at each such first meeting'".

So the subsection will then read as follows:

> "Subsection 7: The Clerk of the Metropolitan Corporation shall preside at each such first meeting, or if there is no Clerk, the members present shall select a member to preside, and the person so selected may vote as a member."

Mr. Chairman, in subsection 6 of Section 4, the Council will be organized in 1955, and at each year thereafter, at its first meeting, the Clerk will preside. Of course, in 1953-1954, the Chairman will preside.

Subsection 7 provides that the Clerk shall preside at the initial meeting of the Council in its organizational stage, and this amendment is simply to make it clear that the Clerk of the Council will preside at the first meeting in the year 1955, and at each first meeting in each year thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is indeed a very minor one, but it should indicate the very thorough manner with which this Bill has been dealt with by the hon. members of the House. There will no doubt be other amendments of more import, but this is indicative of the thorough manner in which this matter has been considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before the amendment is dealt with, we might deal with Section 4, by subsection, to give any hon. member an opportunity to speak on the subsections as they are called.

On Section 4, subsection 1.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, subsection 1 of Section 4 deals with another basic part of this legislation. Unlike the hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Yaremko), I want to deal with a fundamental question here again, and that is the composition of the Council as provided by the Bill, and as discussed on second reading and approved by the House.

The principal content of this Section is that it be a Council composed of an appointed Chairman and indirectly-elected representatives from the various municipalities, which make up the Greater Toronto Area.

As I said when this Bill was discussed on second reading, it is wrong in principle, and wrong to appoint a Chairman --

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is anything about a "Chairman" in subsection 1 at all.

MR. SALSBERG: Subsection 1 speaks about the head of the Council from each municipality, speaks about two members and a number of aldermen.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is another Section dealing with that.

MR. SALSBERG: I will try to combine them all together here. I think it is wrong --

THE CHAIRMAN: We are on subsection 1.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, you just allowed an hon. member to speak on an item which we have not reached, and I have no objection to that, but I do object to you trying to restrict me in an impossible and impractical way.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has an amendment, why not place the amendment before the House, and then speak to it, so we will understand.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Prime Minister is right, and that is a very good point. I will be glad to follow his advice.

I move that all words in Section 4, after the word "persons" in the second line of subsection 1, be deleted, and the following words be inserted in their stead:

"(a) A Metropolitan Mayor and four Metropolitan controllers, to be elected by the voters of the entire Metropolitan Area.

(b) Two Metropolitan Aldermen from each Ward of the City of Toronto, to be elected by the voters of each of the nine Wards.

(c) Two Metropolitan Aldermen from each of the following municipalities: Township of East York, Township of Scarborough, Township of North York, Township of York, and Township of Etobicoke, to be elected by the voters of each of the above-named municipalities.

(d) One Metropolitan Alderman from each of the following municipalities: Village of Forest Hill, Town of Leaside, Village of Long Branch, Town of Mimico, Town of New Toronto, Town of Weston, Village of Swansea, to be elected by the voters of each of these municipalities."

Mr. Chairman, the point I think is quite clear. Instead of having a Council composed of accidentally elected senior members of wards , and an appointed Chairman, adopting my amendment would produce a very democratic type of government in that the Mayor and four Controllers would be elected by all the people directly, to serve on the Metropolitan Council.

MR. D. M. KERR (Dovercourt): Where did the hon. member get that idea?

MR. SALSBERG: I may say to the hon. member (Mr. Kerr) that these ideas come naturally from the process of thinking, and the hon. member, or in fact, anybody else, engaged in that process will also, I am quite sure, come to the same conclusion.

The Mayor and the Board of Control would be elected by all the people; then we would have two aldermen especially elected in each ward as Metropolitan Aldermen, and there would be no mistake in the minds of the people as to whom will go where;

they vote for two alderman in wards 9, 8, 7, 4, 5, and so on, and their job will be to sit on the Metropolitan Council and be engaged in the tremendous job of amalgamating the services and creating a new Metropolitan Municipality, which will be, in my opinion, a full-time job.

Then the major municipalities would have two each -- and I have listed them; the smaller ones would have one each, which would give a total of about forty members, not an unwieldy nor excessively large Council for the establishment of a new Metropolitan government, for a population of one and one-quarter million people. I think that would be a democratic type of set-up, people would directly choose those who would be given enormous taxing powers, and who will be directly responsible and would be elected during the period of transition, until such time as the constituent government would go out of business. So long as the local Municipal government would exist, the electors would elect their own Mayor, Controllers and Aldermen, to take care of the municipal business.

Any other system, in my opinion, is wrong in principle, and insupportable in practice; wrong in principle because it will deprive the people ofthe right to, elect those who will govern, and who will tax

them, and impossible in practice, because you cannot have a Controller of the city of Toronto serving the city, and also serving the Metropolitan Council. The hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling), if he forgets partisanship, I am sure will agree with me. It is physically impossible to do both. Any former Reeve who is in this House will agree with me it is impossible, particularly for the first couple of years, to do justice to his own citizens and his own municipality, and do the job which will be expected of him in the Metropolitan Council.

Therefore, my amendment would create a different set-up, that is true,,but it would be a very democratic set-up. It would be a responsible set-up, and I think one which would be very workable.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member raises a very important matter, one to which we have given a great deal of attention. There is no question but that in the course of time, and with experience, there are going to be changes undoubtedly which will be evolved in the matter of representation. I think we all feel that way. However, we have to look at the problem with which we are presently faced, in order to see if what the hon. member proposes is really satisfactory. The fact is I may have some proposals myself to make

later on, but let me give the hon. member my objections at the present time.

We have in this area, thirteen municipalities coming together. One of these municipalities, the city of Toronto, has some 675,000 population, and the other twelve municipalities' population, three years ago, was 400,000, and today it is 500,000, and I think it is just as sure as anything that when this House meets three years from today, the suburban municipalities will have a population of probably 600,000, at that time approaching the population of the city of Toronto. For this what might be termed the "formative period" certainly for as far ahead as we can see, that is, the next three years let us say, it is very desirable that both areas should have equal representation. The Cummings Report dealt with that phase, and I am satisfied the principle is right. It is arguable that an area having a population of 500,000 people should have 12 representatives, and 12 representatives from the city of Toronto, but we must remember that the city of Toronto is represented by 12 men taken from a body, and there is no doubt but the influence of those 12 might perhaps override the influence of the twelve people who come from separate entities. There is that factor in the

matter to be considered.

The second point is that the Cummings Report dealt with proposals as regards government from the standpoint of a temporary arrangement, and of course the question may be raised as to how long this temporary arrangement may be in effect, before it becomes permanent. You have your local Councils, and they are the main tax collecting bodies; it is through these organizations as presently constituted, that the taxes are collected. The taxes imposed by the Metropolitan Council will be collected through the agencies at the local levels, just the same as the county Councils collect taxes in the 50 or 60 counties we have in Ontario today. I think you can easily see the desirability of having a connection between the collection body and the Metropolitan body.

The Cummings proposals take into account the experiences we have had in the County Council system, and I think when you consider the whole matter, by and large, and consider the problems to be faced, we cannot get a better system at the moment than taking 12 representatives elected from each side of the fence, may I say, representatives of their Councils, men and women with great experience, and bring them together and give them

the power.

I think there are perhaps things which may be suggested. But I do think when you take into consideration all the factors, and consider every angle of this matter, you will agree that equal representation is desirable, that is, that each Council through its agencies, should be represented.

That there will be no amendments to this, I do not for a moment suggest. Of course, there will be amendments, in the course of time. This great city and area will evolve, in the course of time, ways and means to better and strengthen municipal government, but I do think in the foreseeable future -- in the next five or six years -- this system will be the most desirable.

The amendment negatived.

On Section 4, subsection 2.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Subsections 2 and 3, Mr. Chairman, deal with the manner of settling who is to be the deciding voice in the Metropolitan Council in the case of a tie or acclamation.

As I see it, there are two things wrong with these sections; one is I do not think the Council's decision as to who should be eligible to sit on the Metropolitan Council should be made by

the Metropolitan Council itself. It seems to me where there is a tie, or where there is a question of acclamation, as to who should represent the Council, it should be settled at the municipal level, before it gets to the Metropolitan Council. I think there should be a provision in case of a tie vote in a municipality, where it could be decided on the municipal level rather than being projected into the deliberations of the Metropolitan Council itself.

HON. MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this situation does not arise in the Municipal Council.

MR. OLIVER: A tie vote?

HON. MR. PORTER: This sort of thing, on an election.

MR. OLIVER: Certainly a tie vote would arise from time to time.

HON. MR. PORTER: I am sorry. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is quite right. It is rather important, I admit. There is some similar provision in the Municipal Act.

MR. OLIVER: The main objection is to the locality in which it is decided. Why should it not be decided before it gets to the Metropolitan Council. Surely the tie could be broken at municipal level.

If two Aldermen are tied for first place in a ward, the tie could be broken there, but by this legislation, it has to be decided in the Metropolitan Council. I do not think it is a proper includion in the Bill at all.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: That seems to me to be quite reasonable. A tie should be broken in the municipality where it occurs, rather than in the Metropolitan Council. I would agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that it should be decided by the municipality in which it occurs.

HON. MR. FROST: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, these two subsections be held over, and the matter can be further looked into. I will be frank in saying I had some doubt myself as to whether that is proper, in any event. These two subsections might be held over, and we can then go ahead.

Subsections 2 and 3 held over.

On Section 4, subsection 4.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Is the Government ready to tell us who the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council will be?

-- Subsections 4 and 5 agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: No. I will cross that bridge, Mr. Chairman, when we get to it.

On Section 4, subsection 6.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, an objection I

want to take to subsection 6 is that I am presuming -- and I think it is accurate -- that at the beginning of the year 1955, it is the intention of the Government to withdraw their appointee as Chairman of the Metropolitan Council. Having that in mind, the subsection reads:

> "At the first meeting of the Metropolitan Council in the year 1955, and in each year thereafter, at which a quorum is present, the Metropolitan Council shall organize as a council and elect as chairman one of the members of the Metropolitan Council, or any other person, to hold office for that year and until his successor is elected or appointed in accordance with this section."

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, to the House, that I think the word "appointed" should be taken out altogether. There is no reason one can foresee at the moment why this group of 25 people on the Metropolitan Council in 1955 cannot, or would not, or should not, elect their own Chairman. There has never been any difficulty that I can recall in county Councils. They always elect their Warden as Chairman, and I do not think the Government wants the power to appoint a Chairman after 1955.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: We have that power. It is in subsection 8.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is only where they fail to elect.

MR. OLIVER: I agree with that. You have the power, in case they fail to agree. But there is no reason why they should fail to agree. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister, as far as I am concerned, I am one of those who agree that in this formative stage, it is proper the Government should appoint the Chairman for the first year or year and a half. That is understandable. But when it comes to 1955, I would say to the Metropolitan Council, "This is yours. We will not appoint any more Chairmen. You can appoint one from amongst yourselves".

I do not think the word "appointed" should be retained in that section, and there should not be any semblance of a suggestion that the Government would, in 1955, appoint a Chairman, under any circumstances.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I gather the hon. Leader of the Opposition is only raising the question as far as appointments by the Government are concerned, and he is not raising the point that the Council might go outside, and appoint somebody outside its own body.

MR. OLIVER: That is right.

HON. MR. FROST: I agree, and I do not think there is any chance in the world that situation will ever come about. I think in 1955, these people will appoint their own Chairman, but we must recognize we are dealing with two particular interests, one inside the city and one outside. If it should come about in 1955, that there is a deadlock -- which I do not imagine there will be -- somewhat similar to that between Upper and Lower Canada under the Act of Union of 1841 -- this provides a method of appointing a Chairman to carry on, in the event the Council stands at 12 and 12.

I will be frank in saying we do not want to make the appointments. We do want these people to make their own. But if we do run into that position -- which I think is extremely remote -- it eliminates the necessity of convening the Legislature to appoint a Chairman to enable them to carry on business.

(TAKE E FOLLOWS)

MR. HOUCK: Do you think the occasion may arise when the Mayor of Toronto because of his important position, should be chairman of this Council?

HON. MR. FROST: I can name several people in the proposed Council who are very competent people, and I have no doubt that might be an ambition of some Mayor of Toronto in 1955 -- I do not know -- but if so, there are twenty-four members there and they can choose him. They can still decide, and choose their leader.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member has not anything against a man because he is from Toronto, has he?

Subsection 6 agreed to.

On subsection 7.

MR. YAREMKO: I move the amendment which I read earlier.

Amendment agreed to.

Subsections 7 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

On 5, subsection 1.

MR. BECKETT: I would like to move that subsection 1 of section 5 be amended by striking out the word "notify" in the fourth line and inserting in lieu thereof the words "give to". By inserting after the word "council" in the fifth line the words "at least forty-eight hours notice", so that the subsection shall read as

follows:

"The first meeting of the Metropolitan Council shall be held on or after the 15th day of April 1953 at such date, time, and place as the Chairman may determine and the Chairman shall give to each person entitled to be a member of the Metropolitan Council at least forty-eight hours notice of the date, time and place of the meeting and shall preside at the meeting."

Mr. Chairman, the real purpose of this amendment is to give forty-eight hours notice to all the members.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment. The section takes it for granted and provides very clearly that the Council shall meet on the 15th day of April, 1953, in other words a month from now. I am opposed to its speed. I am opposed for all the reasons I gave last week and today.

HON. MR. PORTER: It says, "On or after".

MR. SALSBERG: I know, but my sub-amendment is that all words after the word "held" in line 2 of subsection 1 of section 5 be deleted and the following words be inserted in their stead:

"Within ten days after the date of election of the Metropolitan Council and the Clerk of the Metropolitan Corporation shall notify all elected members of the Council of the date, time, and place of the first meeting of the Metropolitan Council."

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out that the amendment to that section, having been defeated, it is unnecessary to bring the matter up again, and to put that in is of no meaning whatsoever, and it would seem to me that the matter has been decided and that the amendment to the amendment shall be out of order.

MR. SALSBERG: I appreciate the hon. Prime Minister's reasoning, but I assure him that I have some reason for my actions, too. It is true as the hon. Prime Minister argues or suggests -- he did not argue, he suggested -- that the previous amendment having been defeated this could hardly carry. My suggestion is that if this were to carry it would of course necessitate a re-examination of some of the actions taken by this Committee earlier this afternoon.

It is not beyond the bounds of logic and reason to assume that if the members of this House were to agree that the first meeting should take place only after the election, then of course it would necessitate a re-examination of the sections already carried.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is not illogical to reason that we are a bit far afield in the opinion of the Government, but not in my opinion.

HON. MR. PORTER: It is a frivolous amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would be quite simple to rule the amendment out of order, but it might be more simple to take a vote.

The amendment to the amendment negatived.

The amendment agreed to.

Subsection 2 of section 5 agreed to.

On subsection 3.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Chairman, subsection 3 provides that the first meeting in 1954 and thereafter, should be held not later than the 15th of January. My amendment which I will give in a moment, provides that a meeting shall be held after the Councils of the area municipalities have held their first meeting.

Under subsection 2 of section 5 the first meeting of the Council of each area municipality in 1954 and thereafter, is to be held not later than the 8th day of January. We wanted all the local municipalities to have the opportunity to have their elected members ready for the Metropolitan Council.

Therefore I move that subsection 3 of section 5 be amended by inserting after the word "held" in the second line, the words "after the council of all area municipalities have held their first meetings in the year", so that the subsection shall read as follows:

> The first meeting of the Metropolitan Council in the year 1954 and thereafter held after the Councils of all area municipalities have held their first meetings in the year and not later than the 15th day of January on such date and at such time and place as may be fixed by by-law of the Metropolitan Council."

(F follows)

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure this is a proper amendment. What would happen if one of the Council got into difficulties, over a dispute as to the legality of the election, and continued court actions went on for three or four months? You would hold up the work.

HON. MR. FROST: It says, "not later than the 15th of January."

MR. GRUMMETT: I am sorry; I understood that had been taken out.

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection (3) of Section 5 agreed to.

Subsection (4) of Section 5 agreed to.

On Section 5:

MR. KERR: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to subsection (5), as follows:

> "Where a person elected or appointed as Chairman is not one of the persons mentioned in subsection (1) of Section 4, he shall, before taking his seat, take an oath of allegiance on Form 1, and in the years 1955 and thereafter, a declaration of qualifications, Form 2."

This subsection provides that where a Chairman is elected from outside the members of Council, he shall take an oath of allegiance and declaration of qualifications on prescribed forms, which are made part of this Bill by amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. KERR: Mr. Chairman, I would move now that the Bill be amended by adding the following Forms:

> "Form 1, Section 5, subsection (5), the oath of allegiance.
>
> "I, A.B., having been appointed, or elected, as Chairman of the Council of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, or the reigning soveriegn for the time being."

The second one is a declaration of qualifications by the Chairman, and would be Form 2:

> "I, A.B., having been appointed or elected as Chairman of the Council of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, declare that:
>
> "1. I am a British subject and am not a citizen or a subject of any foreign country.
>
> "2. I am of the full age of twenty-one years.
>
> "3. I am not an officer employed by, or a servant of, any areal municipality or any local board of any areal municipality.
>
> "4. I have not, by myself or a partner, directly or indirectly any interest in any contract with or on behalf of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, or any local board thereof, or any areal municipality or local board thereof.

> "5. I have taken the oath of allegiance, Form 1, which I attach hereto, and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing to be of the same force and effect as though made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act."

Motion agreed to.

Subsection (5) of Section 5 agreed to.

On Subsection (6):

MR. COLLINGS: Mr. Chairman, I think this subsection should be broadened, and I move that subsection (6) of Section 5 be amended by adding at the end thereof the words, "and each such declaration shall include a declaration that the memberhas not by himself, or a partner, directly or indirectly, any interest in any contract with or on behalf of the Metropolitan Corporation or any local boards thereof."

That simply means the subsection provides that in his declaration of office each member of the Metropolitan Council shall declare he has no interest in any contract with or on behalf of the Metropolitan Corporation or any local board of the Corporation. Form 19 of the Municipal Act is the form of the oath of office, which a member of the Council must take. That Form does not refer to contracts with a local board of the

municipality concerned.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman,that is just a copy of the oath that a regular member of Council has to take.

MR. COLLINGS: With the addition pertaining to the local boards of the municipality.

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection (6) of Section 5 agreed to.

On subsection (7):

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, subsection (7) now reads:

> "The Metropolitan Council shall be deemed to be organized when the declarations of office have been made by at least seven members, and it may be organized and business may be proceeded with -- "

I would like to move to increase that number to nine, because I believe right there you are establishing a number that constitutes a quorum of Council. I appreciate that during the organizational period there will be a heavy demand on the time of the members constituting Council, in looking after their local duties and their Metropolitan duties. I think seven is too few, and nine by no means too many. While nine is not a majority of the total members of Council, it is a substantial majority of the number of

municipalities unifying their services.

I would move that subsection (7) of Section 5 be amended by striking out the word "seven" in the sixth line and substituting the word "nine", so the subsection shall read as follows:

> "The Metropolitan Council shall be deemed to be organized when the declarations of office have been made by at least nine members, and it may be organized and business proceeded with notwithstanding the failure of any of the other members to make such declarations."

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is sound to provide for the organization of so important a Council by any figure less than at least a majority of members of that Council. If the Council is composed of twelve and a Chairman -- that is, if I do not succeed in changing the whole thing -- then it will be a Council of twenty-five. I think there should be thirteen present before the Council is constituted or organized. I would ask the hon. member for Parkdale to change his amendment to include the figure "thirteen." Otherwise, I shall move an amendment to the amendment.

MR. STEWART: I have no intention of changing it; I thought it out before I made it.

MR. SALSBERG: It has been well received; the House is very happy that the hon. member for Parkdale went to all the trouble of thinking it out.

I move an amendment to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, that the figure be changed from "seven" to "thirteen", which means a majority.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on this particular Section and the one that succeeds it, dealing with the number required for a quorum. I am sorry the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Stewart) is not open to further persuasion in this regard, because I think this constitutes one of the most fundamental sections of the Bill. When one realizes we are now asking for a quorum of nine, and then that five out of that nine would be a properly constituted Metropolitan Council, by virtue of this legislation to carry on all the business which would be assigned to the Council, one begins to wonder. One of the great dangers, as I see it, in this newly organized Council is that you might well, from time to time, have five out of nine from a particular area of this great Metropolitan district, and that majority of the nine might wield an

influence in this meeting out of all proportion to the interest that is involved.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Government, that when this matter is in its preliminary and formative change, as this Metropolitan Council is, it does seem to me that a quorum of nine and a majority of that quorum being five could carry the business of Council. I would suggest to the House we are not protecting or safeguarding this new Council against sectional interests or sectional impact the way we should, if we want to see it pursue a reasonable course.

I would ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to give serious consideration to this. What justification is there for having a quorum of nine out of twenty-five? Why not twelve out of twenty-five? Surely if we had half the members of Council constitute a quorum we would be going a long way towards safeguarding the interests of the various municipalities, all thirteen of them.

HON.MR. DUNBAR: The agenda is sent out forty-eight hours in advance, stating the business which will be taken up at the next meeting; then the members who are interested in the subject to be discussed will be present. In case they

do absent themselves purposely-- and I do not for a moment think that will happen -- in order to hold up some important work, who would receive the criticism? The Government would receive the criticism, the Government who drew up this Act, because they could not foresee that in the organizational period.

MR. OLIVER: That is the most important period.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It is, and that is why we want the quorum of nine so there will be no hold-up in the progress of organization.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think the reasons advanced by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Andrew are valid reasons, and valid suggestions, in connection with the majority of the Council. I recognize that.

We have had similar suggestions made by the Toronto Board of Trade to the Toronto City Council. I can assure the House that hon. members have had the opportunity of giving that problem the very greatest consideration. Of course, there is the point raised by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). I have too much faith in the fine ladies and gentlemen who will be appointed to these Boards

to believe they would ever intentionally obstruct. The point raised by the hon. Minister is, I believe, academic, but which could have validity. We, however, have not seriously considered it.

The hon. member for St. Andrew has sat on Council and he knows the situation. Here is a body made up of twenty-five men. The Chairman is bound to be present at all meetings. The remaining twenty-four are representative of a wide area; we have 250 square miles in the Greater Toronto Area, and these men represent all thirteen Councils; twelve of them, in fact, are heads of Councils. They may run into a situation where there is a conflict as regards meetings, just as in this Legislature we have conflicts regarding dates of meetings.

In this area it has been the custom -- and I expect will continue to be the custom -- for Toronto City Council and, indeed, some of the other Councils, not to hold meetings in July and August. Some of the members spend those months in various fine parts of this Province, such as Haliburton, and other places. I have the pleasure of having some of the members of these Councils as my summer constituents, and I have endeavoured to get them on the voters' list

just in case of a crisis, but to date have been unsuccessful.

A great deal of the work of these twenty-four members is going to be routine work. If you make a quorum too large to start with it means you are going to have an abortive meeting; you are going to have perhaps thirteen members absent and you are going to find it impossible to carry on. The intention was to strengthen subsection (5) so the agenda would be sent out to the members so that, in case of matters of importance, they could be present.

I believe a great deal will be obviated by using reason and common sense. I do not think these twenty-five people, including the Chairman, are going to try to "put anything over" on each other. They will find ways and means to facilitate the business. In later sections we will find this body will probably form an Executive Committee, comprised of the Chairmen of Committees, and this Executive Committee will have the power to deal with certain routine matters. In the course of time, I believe you will find this situation will automatically remedy itself.

I would say to the hon. Leader of the

Opposition that he has raised a good point -- with nine members, five can make decisions, and they may represent one section.

(G-1 follows)

That is true, Mr. Chairman, of the majority; if you have thirteen members, seven can still decide. There is, of course, the fact that a majority being present at the meeting, and the quorum being a majority carries with it the same disability that a quorum of nine does.

I quite agree with the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Stewart) that seven is a bit on the low side; on the other hand, it has been said here nine can be a majority of the municipalities concerned, if it is evenly distributed. I believe Mr. Chairman, if the quorum is made too high, we will be faced with the difficulty of holding meetings when called. On occasion there may be an abortive meeting called, which may waste the time of busy people. It must be remembered these members have their own private businesses; they have their holiday period; they have sittings of their own Boards, Councils and Commissions; and I think it is only reasonable to give them sufficient latitude to enable them to carry on.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I think the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister apply to a normal Council, but they should not be made to apply to an extraordinary Council of this sort in the initial period of its operation.

HON. MR. FROST: This Act, of course, is a projection into a new type of government, and after the greatest of patience and the greatest of care we are going to discover things which will have to be remedied. I have no doubt about that.

I would say that one of the strong points of this legislation is the fact that there is a nine months' period --or eight and a half months.-- of organization, from, say, the 15th of April. If the hon. member for St. Andrew is unsuccessful in making the change he suggests, the Council will meet somewhere around the 15th of April. For eight and a half months it will be in a period of active organization, but it does not assume any real power until the 1st of January, 1954. In all probability, after this Council has been in existence for seven or eight months, we will be faced with the necessity of making changes in the Act. I contemplate that we may have a Session in November or the early part of December, if necessary, to consider matters of that sort.

In the past two years we have had special Sessions of this Legislature. One of them was in September, 1951, to consider very important

legislation dealing with Old Age Pensions. Last fall we had a Session dealing with other important matters, with federal, provincial and other fiscal affairs. May I say, Mr. Chairman, I myself am inclined to/fall Sessions, and if I could find a reasonable excuse for one,I would call one. I think perhaps it is good business.

favour

After seven or eight months' experience it is found necessary to strengthen the Act or to change it, we would not hesitate to call a Session in November or December next to correct anything that might be disclosed in the trial period.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, if some hon. members should succeed in their efforts to arouse the people in this area to the danger of the proposed legislation, is this a promise that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will call a special fall Session to nullify the present Act and adopt new legislation?

HON. MR. FROST: That is a purely hypothetical question.

Subsection (7) of Section 5, as amended, agreed to.

On Section 6:

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, I realize and

appreciate the fact the Government will have to provide an initial meeting place for this new Council, but I am wondering if the Government is going to provide a permanent meeting place for the Metropolitan Council.

HON. MR. FROST: No.

Section 6 agreed to.

On Section 7:

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, whereas it is established that nine members of Council be present to take the declaration of office, I would like to move: that subsection (1) of Section 7 be amended by striking out the word "seven" at the commencement thereof, and substituting the word "nine", so that the subsection will read as follows:

> "Nine members of the Metropolitan Council shall be necessary to form a quorum, and the concurring votes of a majority of members present shall be necessary to carry any resolution or other measure."

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, even if it is only for the record -- and although I still hope that minds might be changed -- I move a subamendment:

> "That the word 'seven' in subsection (1) of Section 7 be deleted and the words 'a majority of the members' be inserted in its stead."

Subamendment negatived.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 7 agreed to.

Section 8 agreed to.

On Section 9:

MR. WEAVER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 9 be amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

> "(5) The seat of a member of the Metropolitan Council shall become vacant if he absents himself continuously from the meetings of the Metropolitan Council during a period of one month without being authorized so to do by a resolution of the Metropolitan Council entered upon its Minutes, and the Council shall forthwith declare the seat to be vacant."

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is in line with the provision in The Municipal Act, although the period is somewhat shorter. The reason for suggesting a period of one month is that it is essential -- particularly in the case of the twelve municipalities -- they should at all times be represented on the Metropolitan Council, and I therefore, suggest if any member is absent for a period longer than a month, without having been excused, there shall be a vacancy declared with respect to his seat. Under subsection (3) of this same Section, the Area municipality from which the member so retiring

comes, immediately -- or within fifteen days -- elects his successor.

MR. OLIVER: It says, "without being authorized so to do by a resolution of the Metropolitan Council". Why would the Metropolitan Council give a written leave of absence for more than a month?

HON. MR. FROST: He might be attending the Coronation.

MR. OLIVER: Anybody might do that. I think it is a pretty clumsy affair.

MR. SALSBERG: What if he is a member of a Park Board, and is sent to the Coronation?

HON. MR. FROST: I beg your pardon?

MR. SALSBERG: What if he is a member of a Park Board, and Council decides to play politics with a situation of this sort, and would not let him go?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member knows they would not do that.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 9, as amended, agreed to.

Section 10 agreed to.

On Section 11:

MR. FROST (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 11 be amended by adding thereto

the following subsection:

> "(2) The Metropolitan Council may, by by-law, provide for paying and annual allowance not exceeding $100 to each Chairman of a Standing Committee, except where such Chairman is the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council."

The Chairmen of all Standing Committees of the City of Toronto receive $100 per year, and, being Chairman for two years, I received a remuneration each year. I understand the Chairmen of many of the twelve municipalities receive no compensation or remuneration; therefore I recommend an amendment providing for remuneration to Chairmen of the Committees.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, would it not be as well to leave it to the discretion of the new Council to enact a by-law?

MR. FROST (Bracondale): The word "may" is in there, which will allow that.

MR. SALSBERG: I did not hear the "may".

(Page G-8 follows)

Subsections 1 and 2 of Section 11 agreed to.

Section 11 agreed to.

Subsections 1 to 3 inclusive of Section 16 agreed to.

On Section 16:

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an admendment to Section 16 before you go on to 17. There does not appear to be any provision for the appointment of a temporary clerk at the inaugural meeting. May I therefore move:

That, Section 16 be amended by adding thereto, the following subsection:

> "(4) The Chairman appointed under subsection (4) of Section 4 shall appoint an Acting Clerk who shall have all the powers and duties of the Clerk for the purposes of the first meeting of the Metropolitan Council in the year 1953 and thereafter until the Metropolitan Council appoints a Clerk and Acting Clerk under this Section."

Subsection 4 of Section 16 agreed to.

Section 16 agreed to.

Subsections 1 and 2 of Section 17 agreed to.

Section 17 agreed to.

Subsections 1 to 3 inclusive of Section 18 agreed to.

Section 18 agreed to.

Subsections 1 to 7 inclusive of Section 19 agreed to.

Section 19 agreed to.

Subsections 1 to 6 inclusive of Section 20 agreed to.

Section 20 agreed to.

On Subsection 1 of Section 21:

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, subsection 1 of Section 21 would, I imagine, provide the opportunity for dealing with needs of the municipal employees whose interests are not safeguarded by the present legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will come under Section 22, Sir.

MR. SALSBERG: Would it?

MR. SALSBERG: Subsection 1 of Section 21 deals with employees, and I was thinking, Mr. Chairman, that this is a good time for all of us to get together and offer the municipal employees the protection for which they ask.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: We have not come to it yet.

MR. SALSBERG: I therefore move:

That the following words be added to subsection 1 of Section 21:

> "When appointing such officers and employees, the Metropolitan Council shall give preference to officers and employees now employed by the municipalities that will comprise the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and shall enact all necessary by-laws to guarantee all the rights and privileges now enjoyed by the employees of the separate municipalities, such as seniority rights, wage rates, wage and salary increment, welfare services and retirement allowances."

I think it is self-explanatory, Mr. Chairman, and all we should do now as friends of Labour -- which all of us are I am sure -- and friends of the civic employees, is to vote for it.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the hon. member's motion I do not think anybody is in disagreement with the tenor of his motion but I do not see how we could be in agreement with the mechanics of the matter by adding that subsection to Section 21. I do not think it is relevant. In the next Section, and indeed in some other legislation before the House, this matter is going to be dealt with, and I think quite effectively within the limits of what this House should do.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should impress our wills on these Councils to the extent of dominating what they do

themselves do. Remember, these Councils are composed of very fine and very fair individuals, just as are hon. members of this House, and I do not think we want to overrule their authority. I would suggest to the hon. member for St. Andrew that for the moment he should withdraw his motion and hold it for the time being, for this reason: when we get through this Section we shall tomorrow go ahead with the assessment portion of the Act, and I give my undertaking, Mr. Chairman, to the House that we shall come back to certain Sections in the Act.

As we go along, I believe we will find these matters are taken care of, and if the hon. member for St. Andrew will withdraw his motion, he may have the opportunity later to put it forward if all these things are not taken care of.

MR. SALSBERG: I shall be very glad to withdraw it, for the time being.

Amendment withdrawn.

Section 21 agreed to.

On Section 22:

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak to Section 22, there seems to be some uneasiness with regard to the future of civic employees. If hon. members will bear with me,

I should like to read a brief explanatory note before I move an amendment to this Section.

A number of questions have been raised as to the status of employees of the Area municipalities who will be transferred from the Area municipalities to the Metropolitan Corporation. Representations have been made that these employees should be protected with respect to their pension rights and sick leave credits.

In amendments to The Municipal Act which will be introduced shortly by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), the pension and sick leave provisions of The Municipal Act -- which are contained in Paragraphs 48 and 49 of Section 386 -- will be rewritten to provide that on transfer from one municipality to another all amounts standing to the credit of the employee in the Pension Fund shall be transferred to the Pension Fund of the municipality to which he is transferred.

A similar provision will appear in The Municipal Act, requiring the transfer of sick leave credits to the municipality to which the employee is transferred.

The authority given to municipalities to establish pension plans and sick leave credit

plans is permissive; no municipality is required by statute to establish such plans. The purpose of this amendment is to require the Metropolitan Corporation to establish a pension plan and a sick leave pension plan before the 1st day of January, 1954. Therefore, the combined effect of the proposed amendments to The Municipal Act and the amendment which I now move will be that all employees transferred from an Area municipality to the Metropolitan Corporation will carry with them into the pension plan and sick leave credit plan established by the Metropolitan Corporation, all credits due in their local plans.

I move that Section 22 be amended by adding thereto the following Section;

> "The Metropolitan Corporation shall pass by-laws under Paragraphs 48 and 49 of Section 386 of The Municipal Act before the 1st day of January, 1954."

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, in further explanation, may I say if hon. members refer to Section 386, Paragraphs 48 and 49, it will be seen it is permissive to set up pension funds and arrangements for sick leave.

Hon. members will notice this Section says "shall"; it makes it mandatory that this Council set up such plans.

Another Act is going to be introduced in the House providing for the transfer of credits from one municipality to another, and in that legislation provision will be made for the transfer of any pensions or sick leave or other credits from the thirteen municipalities to the Area Municipality.

Section 22, subsection (1) agreed to.

Section 22, as amended, agreed to.

Section 23 agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report progress on a certain Bill.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole begs to report progress on Bill No. 80, and begs leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the clock is a little slow and that it is six o'clock.

This evening we would like to go ahead with the Supplementary Estimates and the Estimates of the Department of Labour.

It being six o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

(AA-1 follows)

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

— 0 —

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

— 0 —

Volume XXIII

Monday, March 16, 1953.

— 0 —

EVENING SITTING

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

March 16, 1953,
8.00 o'clock p.m.

The House resumes.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, before submitting these Estimates I thought I should give the House a resume of the various activities of the Department of Labour, what it is doing and what it is attempting to do.

At the outset I would just advise the House what Acts and Statutes are administered by the Department of Labour. There is the Apprenticeship Act, the Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act, the Factory, Shop and Office Building Act, the Fair Employment Practices Act, the Female Employees Fair Remuneration Act, the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, the Industrial Standards Act, the Labour Relations Act, the Minimum Wage Act and the Operating Engineers Act.

Also under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour is the Athletic Control Act, the Bread Sales Act, the Building Trades Protection Act, Department of Labour Act, the Employment Agencies Act, the Government Contract Hours and Wages Act, and others. There is, of course, the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Workmen's Compensation Insurance Act.

Mr. Chairman, I believe, and I think the House will agree with me, that I would not say it if I did not think it because I am a modest man -- that the activities and the administration of these numerous Acts, some old and some new, and the amendments that have been made from time to time by former Governments -- and a great many by this Government -- have played a large part in the industrial development of this Province. I believe we have always led in this field, and as our Acts and our amendments, and particularly our principles, have been accepted in nearly all provinces in this Dominion, I can say the Province has led in the progress made in the Dominion; at least, it has been to some extent due to the administration of these Acts.

I recall that not so long ago the Province of Quebec desired to incorporate into their

statutes our Vacation with Pay Act. I had a talk with the Minister of Labour there, and I sent some of our people to set the Act up as we have it, and that today is in effect in Quebec. In Newfoundland we sent our Chief Boiler Inspector to Newfoundland, where he spent two or three months assisting them to establish the same piece of legislation we have in regard to our boiler inspections.

Numerous requests for information regarding the various pieces of legislation are received in my office from nearly all provinces.

I believe in our administration, over a period of years, we have had the support of both Labour and Management, and if anyone had any doubt as to the truth of this and wishes to cerify it, they have only to look at the last election returns. Labour Unions have played a large and creditable part in the scheme of things; beyond a doubt their activities have created better working conditions and better standards of living by putting more money in the hands of the workers with which to purchase and utilize the things which industry creates, and have, in general, made a great contribution to the happiness and contentment of the workers.

On the other hand, Management has agreed that contented workmen make better workmen, and are meeting as far as possible the wishes of the employees. We must always remember if industry is to continue its operations there must be incentive, there must be reward for energy, initiative and risk. There must be profit; no one can stay in business -- whether it be private or public -- if thereis not a profit in the picture.

(BB-1 follows)

And industry in this land deserves great credit.

If you look around you on the Queen Elizabeth Way and in any of the small hamlets in this province, you will see that industry has, first, great faith in the province, and is pouring large amounts of profits of industry back into that industry, to develop, to create more jobs, to improve its operations, to be able to pay better wages, and give better conditions, and, finally, to maintain Canada's most enviable position as one of the great industrial as well as agricultural, nations of the world.

We are fortunate people, Mr. Chairman, in that management and labour can work so well together in mutual goodwill and understanding. Oh yes, we have troubles, but it would not be a healthy condition if we did not have, because trouble brings out and emphasizes the sore spots, and if they are real, they are corrected, and by this never-ending process, we have developed a system where more people enjoy more of the good things of life than at any other time in the history of man.

From the time I was Mayor of St. Catharines, where I dealt with industry on a municipal basis, to my present position, where I deal on a provincial basis, I know what industry wants,to know; first,

is there an adequate supply of labour with the necessary skills? What is the background of industrial relations? Are the labour laws fair, just, equitable and realistic? Affirmative answers to these questions have resulted in the greatest industrial development this province has ever recorded. The Labour Department has a levelling influence leaning not to one side nor the other, counselling, advising, sometimes insisting and administering. But I am very happy with the result.

I, as Minister, make recommendations, but every member of our Government can take a great share of credit for their advice and their counsel, which have been most valuable in maintaining this province as one of the best places in which to live.

We have gone through a period where little industries have become large industries, and large industries have become larger. What does this all indicate? To me, it indicates that our people in industry have great faith in the people of this province and the possibilities of our tremendous stores of natural resources, including all metals, and now in the western provinces, oil; our high standard of living; the skills of our people, both from an engineering standpoint and of the workers; our sound, solid banking system, the maintenance

of a sound credit -- and I might even add also good Government in this province -- all have played a great part in the development of our province. Industrial expansion has been almost unbelievable. One of the hon. members placed on our desks the other day, a copy of the "Canadian Observer", and one has only to glance through it, to see what is happening in that area. I think that every hon. member here could look around his own municipality, in his own riding, and see the same thing, perhaps not in as great proportion. St. Catharines, my home city, recently annexed 1800 acres, and within two years it is practically all built upon by industry. Let us consider the development of the large automobile industry, the great Ford plant, the increase in General Motors; all over this country industry has been expanding, and more people are coming into more jobs. What does that mean to the Department of Labour? It means more plans to examine, and speaking of plans, may I say that last year, the engineers in charge of the examination of plans for new industry, approved $135,417,800 worth of new industrial development for this province, the greatest in its history. The year before it was $95,103,000. That is the picture of what is taking place industrially in this province. And what makes it desirable?

I say the very things we are doing in the Department of Labour, the examination of plans, the factory inspections, boiler inspections, holidays with pay, more conciliation being required -- all these things add up to a very, very busy department. So I say that these things engender this faith and the things already outlined have played a large part in that result.

I think there are other things which will take a very prominent part in developing a province of contented people, of people who know if they are injured they will be taken care of properly, who know that their working conditions are fair; that hazards to the extent it is possible are removed from their labours. All these I think play a great part.

Then, in regard to Workmen's Compensation. Last year I made quite an extensive address on Workmen's Compensation, but I want to add further to it at this time, and I want to give this House a brief history of the Workmen's Compensation Act, which was brought into force by, I am very happy to say, a former Conservative Government, and which has been improved to some minor extent by former governments, and to a great extent -- and I say this most humbly -- by this Government.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Modesty has certainly gone out of the window.

HON. MR. DALEY: You cannot get away from facts.

MR. SALSBERG: You can.

HON. MR. DALEY: You cannot read into any of the records back of the past ten years any improvements in the Workmen's Compensation Act. If anyone can delve back, and find any, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) can.

In September, 1943, when this Government took office, we put this province back in to the progressive leadership to which it was entitled. At that time, the maximum compensation was only two-thirds of a workman's average earnings up to a maximum of $2500. per year. This meant that no matter how high a workman's earnings were, or what better monetary conditions the labour unions were able to obtain, a workman totally disabled at that time could only receive $32.05 per week, if he was "tops". At that time, the Act provided a workman must be disabled for seven days or longer before he was entitled to compensation at all. In death cases, $125. was all that was allowed for burial, and if the body had to be transported back from some distant point, and the actual transportation

costs were far more, nothing more could be paid.

The operation of the municipal school boards, hospitals, government boards and commissions, did not come into the Act by compulsion. There were numerous number limitations on various industries, requiring those employers to have more than a certain number of persons regularly employed before their operations came under the Act. This denied the employees of small employers any protection under the Act, and because an employer was a small business employer, it was almost impossible for his injured employees to collect from him through the Courts, because if the claim was an extensive one, the employer did not have the assets to cover any award made by the Courts.

Those unfortunate persons who met with permanent disability in the early stages of the Act, when there was no medical aid, if they required artificial appliances because of injuries, they had to continue to buy such artificial appliances out of their meagre pension -- and I use the words "meagre pension" advisedly -- because the maximum compensation was based on 55 percent. of the workmen's earnings up to a maximum of $2,000 a year.

In September, 1943, we had only 23,950 employers in Schedule 1, reporting to the Board.

The assessment that year was $10,842,000.

I considered it as one of my first duties, as a member of this Government, which has always had the interest of the workmen at heart, to bring this Act up to the standard intended by the man who designed it, Sir William Meredith. I realized then this could not be accomplished by legislation alone, but had to be administered by a Board, which had a certain sympathy, yet firmness, and which had a humane understanding of the difficulties of administering this sort of legislation, and I think now -- and I think every hon. member regardless of Party -- will agree that our Workmen's Compensation Board has administered the Act most justly and fairly. Labour was again given representation on the Board. I think it can be said without fear of contradiction that the Board is administering the Act in a fair and humane manner.

Through changes in the Act and regulations, we were able to increase the number of employers whose operations come under the Act by compulsion from 23,950 in September, 1943, to 25,000 as of December, 1944. This increase brought about an assessment of $12,076,000. for the year 1944. In other words, we were able to say that

an additional $2 million was paid out to injured workmen in respect of their accidents.

(TAKE CC FOLLOWS)

Some hon. members of the House will recall the amendments which were before the 1944 Legislature, to bring the operations of municipalities, school boards and hospitals under the Act by compulsion. This added about two thousand more employers under Schedule 1, and a slightly fewer number under Schedule 2. A number of the municipalities, and some of the smaller towns and villages, decided to assume individual liability for accidents to their workmen. These changes increased the 1945 assessment in Schedule 1 to $13,064,000, so in the first two years of my term as Minister, we were responsible for approximately $3 million additional to injured workmen, most of whom would not have come within the provisions of the Act had it not been for our action.

Further amendments brought hotels, restaurants, bus lines, taxi firms, and a number of others under the Act, and, to give hon. members an idea of how these changes increased the coverage under the Act and bearing in mind that increasing activity in Ontario was responsible for part of the increase -- and I think I should point out that it was a Government friendly

to Labour which has done these things, because it may be assumed that industry itself would not have done them, and they are the people who have the money -- but these industries settled in Ontario, and the number of employers whose operations came within the provisions of the Act with respect to Schedule 1 by compulsion was in 1947, 39,000, an increase of 16,000 employers in less than four years.

Further provisions were made for artificial appliances which would be necessary after January 1947, resulting from accidents which happened during the period when there was no medical aid. There were no artificial appliances given, but we brought that under the Act so that all people, no matter when they were injured received free medical aid and free artificial appliances if necessary.

By 1950, through further changes by the Government, and by an increase in activity, we had increased the number of employers whose operations came under Schedule 1, to 47,476. In other words we had doubled the coverage. The annual assessment for the year was $21,991,000, and we had more than doubled the benefits to injured workmen.

We did still another major thing in connection with the Act. We brought our widows' pensions up to $50 and we made it retroactive, which brought those widowed for many years, who

at that time were only receiving $30 and $40 up to $50. We assessed the cost against industry and, as hon. members know, we have an Act before us where we are increasing the pensions again to $75. We are providing increases for children also, but we cannot make that increase retroactive, because of the fact that industry has paid what they consider their assessment each year.

In 1953 the number of persons covered in Schedule 1 by compulsion has risen to 49,917, and the assessment to $22,148,000. In September, 1943, the total number of employees on the Board's staff was 376; today it is 847.

I think most hon. members of this House will remember the major amendments of the last few years. We increased the percentage of compensation from 66 2/3 per cent to 75 per cent, and the maximum from $2,500 to $4,000. The waiting period was reduced from seven days to five days. Medical aid was made unlimited, and in 1946 the medical aid cases were taken out of the hands of Schedule 2 employers and placed directly under the control of the Board, that is, the medical aid of all the railways was taken out of the hands of the employers and placed under the control of the Board.

The House will remember my comments of last year regarding Malton. Our convalescent

centre there is still the only centre operated by a Workmen's Compensation Board on this continent. I think some hon. members will recall reading a very excellent article on Malton in the Globe and Mail about ten days ago.

The Province of British Columbia has followed our lead in physical medicine, but they as yet have only a small clinic where they cannot house or feed the injured workmen and because of this can only treat ambulant cases. The Province of Alberta also has taken a leaf from our book, but on a very limited scale.

We have one of the best physical medical treatment staffs that it is possible to gather together, and as hon. members will note from the report which I am tabling on Workmen's Compensation, they have as many as 520 patients a day at Malton under full care, receiving room and board, excellent treatment and, during all their period at Malton they receive full maximum compensation as well.

Because we have always looked for new fields in which the Government can extend the best in medical services to all injured workmen, I have instructed the Board to begin plans on a physical unit which will be in the northwestern part of the Province so that we do not have to bring injured workmen too far from their homes and friends. Malton is being over-taxed, and a

great many of these people come from the north-western parts of the Province.

I think hon. members of the House will be glad to know that the Board is using the facilities of the physical medical branch of the Red Cross at Windsor, and of the Amity at Hamilton where ambulant patients are receiving skilled physio and occupational therapeutic treatment for hands and certain types of arm and shoulder injuries. We also refer female injured workers to those centres and to a therapy department which we maintain on the second floor of the Toronto General Hospital, where we have use of practically the whole second floor.

Under the borad interpretation which the Board is placing, on my instructions, in the adjudication of the Act, they have, among a number of other things, set up a complete blood bank for injured persons coming under their jurisdiction and can get the blood in an emergency to the remotest section of the Province in a matter of a very few hours. This is done through the chartering of aircraft, delivery by Provincial Police cruisers or any other means of rapid transportation which can be procured. They also maintain adequate supplies of special drugs and a consulting service for any member of the medical profession any place in the Province. All any doctor in this province has to do to get the

benefit of the best medical opinion possible is to pick up the telephone and call the Board's offices, reversing the charges. They can hold the line as long as they like to get all the necessary information they require.

I am certainly proud, Mr. Chairman, of the part played by this government, and by every one of my associates who from day to day bring instances of injustice to the forefront so they can be corrected, and of the part we have played in connection with the Workmen's Compensation.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister of Labour who comprises the Workmen's Compensation Board now?

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Gene Sparrow is the Chairman; Mr. Jack Cauley is the Vice-Chairman, and Dr. Steele is the Commissioner.

Mr.Chairman, we have other things which I think go to engender this faith that I spoke of as the reason industry is coming here and why it is developing and progressing.

In connection with our Hours of Work and Vacation with Pay Act, it is interesting to note that when introduced in 1944, the number of stamps sold from 1944 to March 1945, was $377,236; I shall not give hon. members all the figures but it has gone steadily up until from

April 1952 to January 31, 1953, the sale of stamps amounted to $8,033,000. It will be observed that sales of vacation stamps have increased and continued to increase. Inasmuch as this amount of money -- $8 million last year for holidays with pay -- was only to take care of those people who have intermittent employment, not for the worker of a plant like General Motors of Massey-Harris who have a regular system of holidays with pay and do not purchase stamps. If a man leaves one of those plants, they are required to give stamps for the amount of money he should have a credit for. This $8 million is only to take care of intermittent employment in the construction industry and things like that, where men move about from time to time; so it is estimated that that amount of holiday pay, -- and it is not actually accurate because there is no way of estimating it -- would be about 15 per cent of what is actually paid out in this Province for holidays, which would mean somewhere in the neighbourhood of $260 million each year is paid to the workers as holiday pay.

That certainly is a tremendous figure, Mr. Chairman, and while a great many people had some system of holidays with pay prior to the introduction of this Act, the people who now receive this $8 million got nothing. Hon. members will see what has developed inthe interests of the

workers of this Province, $260 million, approximately, in a year for holiday pay.

Our conciliation service is a part of our work which runs into unwarranted considerable criticism, but still I am going to admit that no doubt improvements can be made.

(DD-1 follows)

But I think if you will look at the record of the conciliation services for this province you will agree with me that some of the criticisms are not deserved. When you figure that last year we had a total of 854 cases for conciliation, you will realize that it requires many meetings, a greater deal of discussion, to deal with management and labour on 854 occasions. The appearance of a conciliation officer to meet with the people, resulted in a settlement of 516 of these cases, without any further necessity to continue any negotiations. The agreement was made as between management and labour with the conciliation officer sitting in , in 516 of these cases.

Conciliation boards were set up in 269 cases, and when you boil it down, we had in this great industrial province with all the activities, with the great effort being put forth by organized labour to organize the workers, with which I do not disagree, only 24 strikes. That would appear to me to be a most estimable, wonderful record, which in my opinion indicates that our labour relations system, our conciliation services, and all the things that we do, are doing a reasonably good job.

"Why are there so many delays?" They say to me. "Why cannot we get the answer to these things quicker?" We have a procedure

and I think it is a good one, and after all you must remember that conciliation is designed to delay, in some ways, hasty actions. It is easy to rush out and get yourself tangled up in a strike, but sometimes it is not so easy to get out of it. It is far better to have a system that has a levelling influence to give far more opportunity to consider what they are entering into.

So sometimes when application is made for conciliation services, and on investigation we find that the parties have not been negotiating between themselves, we just simply refuse and say, "No, go back and get together and settle this matter yourselves." We are not going to adopt a spoon-feeding or pampering course. Let the two parties get together on these things and in a great many cases they will not come back for conciliation, and if they do and they are unable to agree and we are satisfied that they have made an honest effort to reach agreement, we enter into the picture. We set up conciliation services and it goes to a concialiation officer. If he is u able to bring the parties together, he probably recommends a board. We set up a board and the board meets and discusses the question with the two parties, representative of the Union, a representative of management and a chairman which I usually have

to appoint, and then if they cannot resolve the dispute, they issue their report to me and I send it out to the workers and in seven days the workers can take whatever action they choose. In other words they can go on strike quite legally.

I have ten conciliation officers at the present time whose records I have not given in detail, but they are doing an excellent job. A conciliation officer requires special qualifications; I think you will agree with that. He should be a man of great tenacity. He must not let go, and he has to have a lot of courage to express what he actually thinks should be done in cases and he must be firm, and I would say that there is no finer group of men, and no group to equal ours. . The Federal Government, I believe, has three conciliation officers, but they have a very small percentage of the work our people do, because they deal mostly with railways and interprovincial trucking and that sort of thing.

We also appoint boards, and I want to say to these boards -- and I think probably I can say it here and it will reach them -- that I am not looking for reports from these boards. What I want are settlements. I think the conciliation boards are tending to rely too much on reports. They examine into the problem and make a report

and there first duty is to effect a settlement if it is possible, and that is what I want.

I am also going to say to both management and labour that when the Board reports, sometimes there is a majority and a minority report, and I would like to say that I am going to send the majorty report out after a reasonable period of time if I do not have the minority report at hand. It is not labour that offends any more than management, but often I will be criticized and my department will be criticized for the delay in making a decision. The Chairman of the Board has made his report with probably one member, which would be the majority report, and we wait for the minority report and it does not come. I am saying that I am going to send the majority report out after a very reasonable time in the future and I am advising both organized labour and management that they must get their reports in.

Another sphere of our activity is one that I am rather proud of and certainly we have not got it perfect, but you have heard so much of silicosis. We attacked this problem some years ago.

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. minister would not mind, would he care to tell us at this time approximately what is the percentage of judges who are appointed to these conciliation boards?

HON. MR. DALEY: I would say the great percentage of them are judges because a judge is probably as well fitted -- I won't say "better" -- but as well fitted because of his impartiality and is not depending upon this work for a livelihood, and his ability to hear evidence and make decisions, I think, qualifies a judge about as well as any other person. But we do not stick entirely to judges, and I am hoping to have suggestions made as to who might make conciliation chairmen. We need them all the time.

I was speaking of silicosis. We have made a great deal of progress in this matter in our efforts to stamp it out if possible. We have compulsory examinations, as you know, now. I had appointed two inspectors some three years ago to deal entirely with foundry work.

We have by education, persuasion, without actually making regulations as yet, found a great improvement, a great willingness on the part of the foundry operators to cooperate by having better housekeeping and better ventilation.

These things have been done and I am satisfied that in all of the large foundries they are about as safe as it is possible for men to make them.

The ventilation system and the general operation of large foundries in this province are excellent and we have many small foundries, but we have to be careful to not adopt regulations which might force small people out of business if the installations were too costly. We have worked patiently and carefully with them, and I must say we have generally improved the foundries to such an extent that I feel very soon we will be able to draw up some minimum regulations for the operation of foundries.

MR. SALSBERG: Has the hon. minister introduced compulsory X-ray services that we spoke about some years ago.

HON. MR. DALEY: They are in effect, yes.

Re Labour Relations Act: The only thing I can say about it is that it works. It also was criticized but the results I have already pointed out from the operation of the Act regarding conciliation in all of the cases have only resulted in twenty-four strikes held and twenty-four strikes settled last year. I think that is a very good record.

I have resisted for years amendments which would give one side or the other the edge. This Act gives the worker the right to organize without fear of discrimination and protects the employer. The employers claim it leans on the

side of labour and labour claims it leans on the side of management, and that just makes it to my mind perfect.

But what we do know is that under our Labour Act, our conciliation services have kept labour and management of this province on even keel and have maintained in this period, an industrial expansion, never before equalled in this and their province being able to continue operations without too many disruptions.

I pay tribute again to members of the Board of Conciliation, and the members of the Labour Relations Board who, as you know, are two representatives of labour and two representatives of management with an impartial chairman. We have an Act, as you know, which prevents discrimination.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the minister care to elaborate on the question of the chairmanship of the Board, or would he prefer just to pass it ocer? I am not pressing for it, I thought he had forgotten.

MR. DALEY: Unfortunately a couple of months ago we were advised that the then chairman who was doing a very excellent job was going to leave us, and we were confronted immediately With the problem of finding a chairman. That is not an easy thing to do as the hon. member will admit. It is pretty hard to pick a

chairman for a labour relations board, .. who has had any experience, one with the legal knowledge necessary, and so we fell back on our stalwart and great friend of labour and a great personality in the field of labour relations, Professor Pringle.

I asked him as a personal favour to come. He did not wish to come back. He was chairman and he developed most of the procedure and did an excellent job in formulating the Labour Relations Act.

(EE follows)

He agreed that he would take it on temporarily and he is now the Chairman of the Labour Relations Board. I am still hunting for someone to appoint as permanent Chairman, but in the meantime, I decided to appoint my Deputy as Vice-Chairman. It is essential we should have a permanent Chairman and have someone who can step in for any reason, illness, holidays or anything else, and have someone to take over and I thought it would be a great thing to have my Deputy as Vice-Chairman.

We have an Act to prevent discrimination because of race, creed, colour, or place of origin, and I want to report it is working very satisfactorily. Our method of administration is simple and practical and I would like to point out that in my own Department, I have many races. I have Jewish people, coloured people, Japanese, Italian and other races, and all doing a very fine and commendable job, and they are all highly regarded by their fellow workers.

In establishing this no discrimination policy, we looked for a simple way, and we have forms to be filled out by anyone who claims to be aggrieved because of discrimination. The method we use is that these forms must be filled out by the individual, not by any organization or somebody who may have heard of somebody who is discriminated against,

the actual person who claims to have been discriminated against, must fill out this form. No matter where it is, if it is at the head of the lakes, in Windsor, or Ottawa, or anywhere else, we will have one of our inspectors look into it that very day, and if he is not satisfied or cannot settle the matter, we will have a conciliation officer there in no time. A case is never left hanging, in a very few days the case will either be settled satisfactorily or there will be some action taken. I think it is working very well and I think that our employers have accepted it. There has been no question. Employers in this province are very law-abiding and they have accepted this Act and are doing everything they can to see there is no discrimination. Of course, we will never get to the point where there will not be some, but the numbers we have had have been very small.

We are doing a job on apprenticeship, every day the need for more skilled mechanics becomes more acute, the construction trades, industrial trades, every type of skill is required in this expanding industrial activity. Back in 1928, an Act was passed, sponsored by the late G. Howard Ferguson, providing for compulsory apprenticeship

training, This was the first legislation, certainly in Canada, and I believe on the Continent, and the legisaltion has been followed by an extensive program which has been carried out with increasing momentum since that time. Today, many skills have to be imported into this country but what we want to see is our own boys given every chance to acquire skill because it offers today continuity of employment, good wages, and a great measure of security. Many of the apprentices of yesteryear are the contractors and the business executives of today. My estimates will disclose that additional money is required to carry on this program and I would point out that each dollar is matched by the Federal Government. For every dollar we put in, they put one in, for they are also appreciative of the work which is being done.

Back in the time of the American Revolution, Franklin said, "Every man who has a trade, has an estate", and I believe that to be true. I want to encourage the young men of this province who have not the opportunity to go on to higher education to get into a skilled trade. It is a great thing. It is not hard to do. You may not necessarily follow it all your life, but it is a great thing to have, and is "an estate" just as Benjamin Franklin said.

This year, we will have about 2,381 young

men taking the ten-week course in various trades as part of the apprenticeship program, taught by highly skilled instructors at the Provincial Institute of Trades in Toronto. My advice to young men is to give this matter very careful consideration.

These things I have mentioned have added greatly to this province as a desirable place to locate and do business, and in spite of the increases I have requested in my budget, I assure this House there are only funds adequate to do the job, and nothing more. These estimates have been checked and re-checked by the Treasury Board and I now submit them for the approval of this House.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not rise and pay tribute to the work of the Workmen's Compensation Board as administered by the hon. Minister of Labour, (Mr.Daley) of this province. I, who have the honour of representing Perth riding, in my home town, know of two different cases, railroad workers, one a conductor in the operating department of the Canadian National Railways, a publicly owned railway, and the other a foreman in the maintenance department, who, after nearly six or seven months treatment at Malton, have been able to resume their

work. I think it would be a happy day if all hon. members of this House and everyone who has to work for a living, are covered by the Workmen's Compensation Act..

In speaking of the apprenticeship system, I happen to have a father-in-law who is close to 85, who served eight or nine years learning the carpentry business. That, by the way, Mr. Chairman, was in Ireland. My only wish and hope is that some day, the Department of Education and the employers of this country, in industry, should get together and have a fair score for those who go into our high schools, our collegiates, and so forth, and can take their proper place in our world.

MR. A. WREN (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has made some remarks about the Compensation Board, and about labour generally, to which today I would like to refer for a moment in opening this discussion on the Estimates for the Department of Labour. I think the hon. Minister (Mr Daley) in his attitude toward labour, and taking all the credit for the things which have been done for labour, might well remember that the compensation rate you were paying when your Government came into power in 1943, was in the making for some ten or fifteen years. I can recall that the former

government, the Henry administration, when it was in power, were only paying $5 a month to labour, and it was not hard to pay sixty-six and two-thirds of that.

I do want to say, though, in referring to the hon. Minister's remarks on the Compensation Board that I think it is regrettable now that there is nothing provided for -- while it may require a change in administration to do it -- there is nothing provided for, the widows of the disabled persons who were victims of industrial accidents. I can appreciate the charges which have to be made back to industry or back to the government, to the Consolidated Revenue Fund to provide for these people, but, while you say you cannot make these charges to industry retroactive, the loss of limbs and the loss of eyes, the pain and suffering which many of these widows have had to go through, is a blight on their lives, because their industrial accidents are still retroactive.

I think in a province like this, a province which has the industrial wealth which this has today--- and not only this Government but all the governments in Canada who get the buoyant revenues they have today --

should have some provision better than $50 a month, for instance, for a widow whose husband's life was lost in making the industrial empire as great as it is today in Canada. I think there is something remiss in our administration and I think as long as that condition obtains, as long as it continues, despite all the other fine things which I readily admit the Compensation Board is doing, I think it will remain forever a blight on your department.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of speaking on Compensation, I tried to do that on Friday when we were dealing with the Compensation Bill. I will make very few preliminary remarks, Mr. Chairman, and will deal with a specific vote which is before us.

Before doing that, however, I feel duty bound to spoil a little the self-satisfaction, the complacency which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has displayed through the last hour. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is a generally jovial man, he is a happy individual, and I am glad to see that. However, he is taking credit for swimming without an effort when a brick could swim under these circumstances. It is said

that in the Dead Sea, the buoyancy, because of the chemical contents of the water, is so great that you just cannot sink, any human being goes in, stretches out, and floats. I think the hon. Minister of Labour and his Department are in a condition not unlike that of the Dead Sea. The hon. Minister of Labour can swim very easily, he is the beneficiary of conditions, circumstances, with which he had nothing to do The general buoyancy which enables him to swim without effort, to lie back and smile, is really due to factors for which he cannot claim credit. I will give him as much as he is willing to take, but it is unfortunate he does not take much advice from me because if he did, he would receive more credit than he has received up to now. Having made that remarks, I would say there is a certain trend, a tendency in the Department, which I think should be spoken of and criticized very sharply at this time. Things are not quite as rosy in the labour movement, the trade unions are not quite that happy about developments in the Department of Labour as the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) would like the House to think they are.The Department, as well as the whole Government, is displaying signs of indifference to the attitude which prevails outside. It is a case of excessive power, the Government has

behind it so many hon. members that they think they can do anything they like regardless of what is said outside.

(TAKE FF FOLLOWS)

For instance, with all due respect to the present Deputy Minister of Labour -- and I find no fault with him nor his ability -- I think it was an act of defiance of the labour movement when the Government selected the present Deputy. That has nothing to do with his qualifications. He is undoubtedly a qualified person. But it had been the tradition established for years that the Deputy Minister of Labour came from the ranks of labour. The former Deputy was a carpenter and came from the same area as the hon. Minister of Labour.

HON. MR. DALEY: We just reversed things. I am the carpenter.

MR. SALSBERG: This Government just appointed somebody from outside, and tradition was broken. Last year, this Government defied the whole labour movement in the selection of a Chairman of the Labour Board, who was all his life representative of business and industry, and every segment of the Trade Union Movement was up in arms, but the hon. Minister of Labour was not disturbed, he just gloated. He was in a position where he could gloat, and he did not care. The A. F. of L., the C.I.O., other labour unions, the railway men, all were up in arms --

HON.MR. DALEY: I do not think you should say that in the first place, because you have no

connection with any of these people.

MR. SALSBERG: You no sooner prick the hon. Minister of Labour, than he begins that attack, a very childish and immature way of dodging an argument. Every intelligent person who reads the papers in the province knows that there were protests from one end of the province to the other; all the workmen were up in arms, but the hon. Minister of Labour did not care.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: May I ask a question?

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Minister of Public Works wants to ask a question, very well.

HON. MR. GRIESINGER: I want to ask the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) what he has ever contributed to this province or this country, outside of criticism?

MR. SALSBERG: I have never failed to answer a question. If I was to follow the tactics of the hon. Minister of Labour, I would say, "What do you know about it?" , but I will say that I have contributed as much as any hon. member in this House of my years, as a worker in industry in this province, and as a member of a union.

MR. GRIESINGER: Where did the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) work?

MR. SALSBERG: Ask the Chairman of your Conciliation Board. He will tell you. Ask the hon. Minister of Labour, he will tell you. The head of your Conciliation Department and I worked for years in the same plant. I was secretary of my local union when I still wore short pants. I went to work in industry in this city at an age when the employer put myself and some other youngsters out on the fire escape to dodge the inspector who came to find out if he was employing youngsters who were below the legal age. I do not know how much the hon. Minister of Labour has performed, but I have done as much as any hon. Minister, insofar as productive labour is concerned, within the limits of the employment in which I grew up.

As for criticism; I will never apologize for it. I think it is the most useful contribution a member of this House could make, particularly from this side, when he sharply criticizes the Government, and may I say to the hon. Prime Minister, when a member acts as a gadfly on this Government.

HON. MR. PORTER: A warble fly.

MR. SALSBERG: To stop them from falling asleep, and wake them up when they begin to snore, and get them into action, in order that they will do things.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 96.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Public Works asked a question. Sometimes, they become attracted to me, whenever I rise to speak. I do not mind it at all.

I said the hon. Minister of Labour defied all trade unionists in the selection of Mr. Davis, who has later resigned, and he again defied the trade union movement by appointing his Deputy as the Assistant Chairman. The A.F. of L., the C.C.L., and others were up in arms. They said it was impossible for the Deputy Minister of Labour to act on this Board, as Chairman at times, without bringing politics to bear upon the actions and decisions of the Board. Surely no one can question that statement.

I mention these few items, not by way of criticism of Mr. Metzler, the Deputy Minister, whom I am glad to see on the floor tonight. I have no criticism of him as an individual, and I do not question his ability. I hope he will understand that. What I am criticizing is the policy of the Government, as I usually do.

But coming now to vote No. 96, Item 5: I want to deal with the question of conciliation. There is a provision there for conciliation machinery. The hon. Minister has spoken at length about the

great work of his Conciliation Board. I would like, for a few moments, to give to the House, the other side of the picture, insofar as the Conciliation machinery is concerned.

According to the hon. Minister, all is well in the best of worlds. But they have had a great deal of trouble. Let me just cite two or three headlines to give you the other side of the picture, and when it is totalled up, it will constitute the experience over two years which labour has had with the conciliation machinery of the Government.

About two years ago, we, in this House, were confronted with a situation in Windsor, and the union and its official paper at the time openly stated "'Stalling embitters Ford workers', goes on to say, "Ontario Labour Act provides opportunity for Company to Stall Seven Months", during which time the situation became so tense that anything became possible, and uncalled strikes took place.

A little later, in 1951 again, the Telegram reports, "Sees too much left to Conciliation Board". That was on December 4th, 1951, and in the story from Windsor, the Telegram said:

> "Criticism of negotiators for Ford of Canada and the CIO-CCL United Automobile Workers' Union is contained in a supplementary report

accompanying the Conciliation Board recommendations on the contract dispute at the strikebound Windsor auto plant."

Then it goes on to say, a little farther down:

"'It is an obvious fact that virtually no collective bargaining had taken place between the parties in connection with the present contract re-negotiation,' wrote Mr. Presgrave. 'This is evidenced by the existence of a great many demands and voluminous written argument and evidence. Many of the demands are of such a nature that settlement by discussion between the parties should have been readily feasible. Several are such that even after the recommendations of the board are made, negotiations will still be necessary.'"

Later, we have the following headline, "Strike Sentiment Growing says Bookbinders' Official", and speaking of the strike on the Toronto Transportation Commission, they blame the delay in receiving the conciliation report.

Then we go to 1952, and we meet again the same problem. And I quote a headline from the Globe & Mail of January 4th, 1952, "Predicts Printers' Strike if Report is Delayed". The one who made that statement is a present Controller of the city of Toronto, Mr. Brand. Then a headline in the Star of that date says, "Conciliation Failure, take Law in Own Hands -- Brand".

Then a little later on, we get the headline, "Blames Legislation for Strikes, Unrest Conciliation Rapped", and we find in the story from Hamilton the following:

> "Harry Simon, Chairman of the special committee of the Federation on Labor Relations' Act, said strikes and labor unrest could be laid at the door of ineffective labor legislation and the manner in which some sections of the Labor Relations" Act are administered.
>
> The committee, he said, specifically had in mind the conciliation services and the long waiting periods many unions have to endure before a report of a conciliation board is handed down."

Again in 1952, we find, "Seek Action to Speed Conciliation Processes". That is from the Globe & Mail of January 14th, 1952.

(TAKE GG FOLLOWS)

A few months later, by 1952, the papers report: "F fty-day limit for conciliation labour's demand, " they couldn't go on with the present limitless drag that they experienced. In the memorandum which the Trades and Labour Congress, the Provincial Federation, presented to this Government, this same item was stressed. I do not want to burden the House with reading it, but I will give it to anyone who wants to see it. That is the official memorandum they presented to the Government.

The C.C.L. unions presented a memorandum last January or February and again the same complaint: "Conciliation process long, dragging, demoralizing, le ding to strife."

That is two years ago, Mr.Chairman. Now we are coming to 1953. Despite everything the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) says, we find the Ontario Federation of Labour brief -- and the headlines I am reading are from The Globe of March 12, that is pretty close to our date: "O.F.L. brief to Frost attacks Metzler's role." That is one story, and underneath is another story: "Conciliation said weapon against Union efforts." That is the statement made on the 12th of this month by representatives of the Ontario Federation of Labour and the C.C.L. May I, Mr. Chairman, quote just a few lines from this story in the Globe:

"Federation President George Burt described Conciliation Boards as 'the best weapon reactionary employers have to use against a Union,' and he said the Government's legislation dealing with conciliation places you right alongside these employers."

In other words, he means the Government's legislation places it alongside these employers. Further on in this same story in the Globe, we read:

". . . Mr. Burt noted. He said a conciliation Board does not perform a judicial function and that many Chariamen merely act as investigators gathering evidence and avoid discussing the possibility of a settlement with the parties."

HON. MR. DALEY: I doubt that.

MR. SALSBERG: All right. I am merely reading what the President of the Ontario Federation of Labour said.

HON. MR. DALEY: I was there. The hon. member does not need to read it to me; I was there.

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry; it is quoted in the Globe, and if it is incorrect we will brand the Globe as misrepresenting. I am quoting the Globe which in turn is quoting George Burt, they put it in quotation marks. And that this is obviously correct is evidenced by another

clipping from the Globe -- I think I am safe when I quote the Globe -- and this time from an article from the same gentleman whom the hon. Minister of Labour did not mention by name, but to whom he referred as having written a wonderful article about Malton, that is ny the Labour reporter of the Globe.

HON. MR. FROST: I do not want to spoil the hon. member's speech, because he always makes very good and interesting speeches.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, the hon. Prime Minister is not spoiling it; I can start all over again.

HON. MR. FROST: But what are the facts? If this had not happened, the hon. member would have been talking about Mr.Davis who was the Chairman and who resigned a short time ago. There was a great deal of complaint about Mr. Davis, Mr. Chairman; he was going to be undemocratic, he was going to represent employers, and he was going to do a number of things. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Davis was only there about six months and by that time everybody thought he was a wonderful fellow who was doing a wonderful job.

After all these years, let the hon. member have a little confidence in good government. As a matter of fact, all sorts of routine matters come up with the Labour Relations Board.

T ey can be very easily disposed of. Mr. Metzler here can handle things about which there is no controversy. When they get into controversial matter at the present time Professor Finkelman, who I think has the confidence of everybody, is there as Chairman of the Board and is doing an excellent job. Everyone is satisfied, there are no controversies; and in due course another man as good as Mr.Draper, and as good as Mr.Davis, and as good as Professor Finkelman, will be appointed and everybody will be pleased and satisfied.

I say to the hon. member, if he would quit taking these bogies out of the clothes closet or out of dark corners and scaring himself to death, and everybody else with him, but would just keep the boat steady, everything would be all right. I think he allows everything he reads in the papers to disturb his sleep and his point of view. Now I simply ask him to remain steady and he will find things will be all right.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. Prime Minister I have no bogeyman in my closet; what happens is that I open the Government's clothes closet and they fall out. It is not my fault that they are there. As a matter of fact I have no closets, so how could I have anything there? You have given me a room without a closet-- in fact you have given me a room

that is not a room. However, I will leave that aside. So if there are bogeymen here, they fall out of the Government's closets, Mr. Chairman, because I have none.

All I was dealimg with was the Conciliation problem, and I have another quotation, this time from Mr. List, who has written a wonderful article on Malton. I liked his article, I thought it was very well done, and that it revealed what should be revealed about the fine work that is being done at Malton. But speaking of the conciliation machinery, on March 13th Mr. List had an article in the Globe which says:

> "The Ontario Federation of Labour in its brief to Premier Frost and the Cabinet Wednesday had much to say about the conciliation services of the Province but little of it was complimentary.
>
> "There were complaints of long delays, lack of conciliation by conciliation boards and inadequate staffing of the conciliation service."

HON. MR. FROST: On the other side, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows that much as we would like to please George Burt, it is like trying to please the hon. member, you cannot please my hon. friend.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh yes, you can; just try.

NON. MR. FROST: I have nothing against

George Burt; he is a nice fellow, but you cannot please him. I would suggest the hon. member look at this problem after ten years of the beneficial government of this Government; very few strikes, things going along, more money in the pockets of the workers and the people. Now the hon. member should be a little more satisfied. In conciliation of course there are difficulties but remember that to choose conciliation boards is a pretty difficult thing to satisfy everybody, but by and large it is a pretty good job.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I have been looking at the Government's record for ten years -- I have been here as long as this Government -- and the result is I need glasses now. I did not need them before.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, that is just on account of old age.

MR. SALSBERG: No, that is because of the Government's record being so dark, that it just affects my eyes. However, I was not quoting Mr. Burt, I was quoting Mr. List, the Labour specialist, who said there was very little to compliment the Government on, as the heading in the Globe indicates: "Conciliation complaints could stand studying." All I ask of hon. members in this House, who I am sure appreciate the reasonableness of my presentation, is to under-

stand that if the Globe and Mail Labour reporter thinks this Government can study the complaints, then of course I am not harsh at all.

MR. JANES: Does the hon. member think there are conciliation boards in Russia?

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know. We were speaking of George Burt. Now the Government has many good friends in the A.F. of L. group, in fact I know some leaders of the Ontario Federation who I think a little while ago were members of the provincial executive of the Progressive Conservative Party, people who are good friends of mine privately; let us see what they said. I have this time The Telegram in my hand, a paper you cannot suspect, and a Labour group you cannot suspect either. The Telegram of January 19th , 1953, says in part -- and they are reported, by the way, from the A.F. of L. Ontario Provincial Federation of Labour convention that took place in Windsor:

> "speakers were aroused by a report issued on the activities of their officers during the past year, which showed that very little action had been taken by the Ontario Government on proposed legislative changes submitted by the Federation."

And further on the same report says:

> "Russell Harvey, Chief organizer for the A.F.L. in Canada and a member of the Ontario Labour Board, charged that the statute designed to give Labour the right to prosecute employers was of no value whatsoever."

However, I am not going into the details of that, I am addressing myself to conciliation and bringing these things to the attention of the House as I think is right and proper to do.

(GG - 9 follows)

HON. MR. DALEY: We settle those disputes before there is any need to prosecute.

MR. SALSBERG: I say it is proper, I think, to bring before the House the opinions of all sections of the Trades and Union movement in addition of course to my own humble opinion, and I shall close with this shocking -- and I hope it will shock the Government -- heading of a story in the Star of January 13th, in which it is said, no more and no less:

"Daley is worse than Duplessis man, says strikers' spokesman."

Having brought these facts to your attention, Mr. Chairman, I think we can more soberly approach the Estimates of the Labour Department and in so far as the conciliation machine is concerned, may I now suggest to the Government what I suggested a year ago, and I want to express the sincere hope that the Government will more seriously than they have during the past year take into account this suggestion:

First, that the conciliation machinery is bad, for a number of reasons. First, because many employers unfortunately do not want to negotiate and desire to drag negotiations and therefore

conciliation boards have to be set up when, with a bit of goodwill on their part, they could get together with the spokesmen for their workmen and come to an understanding without the need of conciliation. That is bad.

And because they know conciliation is compulsory they sit back and go through the motions of negotiation, knowing that after these motions have been gone through, a conciliation board will be essential and then they can gain some time. In other words, the idea is: "I have always got time to haggle, I have always time to grant the demands of Labour," so they sit back and it drags on for weeks and months and situations become tense and often beyond control. That is bad.

Therefore I suggest to the Government that conciliation should not be compulsory, but voluntary; either side can ask to let the employer,who still has not accepted collective bargaining as an integral part of his duties, know that there may be no time element for him in protracted conciliation proceedings.

HON. MR. DALEY: That is the law of the jungle.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, I think many

employers would act far faster if they knew there was not going to be a lapse of weeks and months. And if the union or employer wants conciliation, fine; let them ask for it.

A second suggestion to the Government is that wherever you do appoint conciliation boards, do not appoint men from the Bench. I say this without prejudice to any of those gentlemen, but as Mr. List in that Globe article points out, and I think with a great deal of soundness, the trouble is that conciliators and chairmen of conciliation boards all too often fail to conciliate, they forget their role, and particularly when a man is a Judge he will sit as if he were in a Court, take evidence, listen to opinions, make notes and then make a report; and Mr. List correctly points out that many Labour leaders have drawn attention to the fact that,for instance, the head of the Conciliation Department of this Government, Mr. Fine, has an excellent record in settling disputes. The hon. Minister of Labour himself on a number of occasions has stepped in when a crisis was threatening and managed to get a settlement, because the job of the Conciliation Board should be not to take evidence, but to bring together and try to find a basis of

settlement.

Mr. List mentions another member of the Conciliation panel of the Government, who has, according to him, an unusual record of settlement of disputes, and I ask the Government to give a thought to this question, where conciliation boards are necessary, appoint people who will try to bring the two parties together and find an amicable settlement which will be acceptable, but do not create boards which will sit for weeks and then bring in legal documents containing very objective, unrelated opinions about a situation. I think then you will accomplish much more than has been accomplished up till now.

The main point I want to make at this stage, Mr. Chairman, is on the conciliation machinery the Government provides. I want to present other people's opinions in the hope that they will carry weight with the Government. I added my own suggestions, and I trust the Government will act upon those suggestions I have made and which are being made by responsible spokesmen of the trade union movement, as well as by journalists who are specializing in the Labour field.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, Vote 10, Item 10. I could have referred to this on Friday afternoon but I realized at that time when the amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act was being read for the second time, that hon. members were in a hurry to get away.

I am sure we all listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) this evening. I regret very much that the amendment to the Act for the payment of pensions to widows and orphans is not to be made retroactive.

(HH-1 follows)

I have a case down in my riding where a young veteran lost his life in the employ of General Motors last December, leaving behind a widow and four small children under sixteen. Of course, because this amendment is not retroactive they will get a pension of $98 a month. I think we could do something about that, Mr. Chairman. Even if it only went back for two or three years we could ask the employers if they would meet the challenge in going back for the remainder of the time, or take it out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

We have a vote before us this evening with respect to the superannuation fund for teachers which will make a total of $2 million for this year. I am going to vote for that, but surely if we can do it for the teachers, we can do something for those people on pension. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he would just consider that. I am not opposed to the $2 million for the teachers' superannuation, I will vote for that, but if we can do it for the teachers, we can do it for the orphans and widows of those men who have lost their lives in industry.

Votes 96 and 97 agreed to.

On vote 98.

MR. GRUMMETT: I wonder if the hon. minister would explain vote 98, item 6, a little

more fully. I would like to know just what is done with the money in connection with apprenticeship training and special classes, where they are held and so forth.

HON. MR. DALEY: They are held at the Ontario Provincial Institute of Training, and that is for payment for maintenance and teaching staffs, and all that sort of thing. It is actually double that amount because that is our share.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is the Ontario share; you have the Dominion as well.

HON. MR. DALEY: Yes.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Does the Federal Government meet dollar for dollar on the whole amount of $435,000? Do they match that dollar for dollar, the whole thing?

HON. MR. DALEY: Yes, they share travelling expenses and everything.

MR. SALSBERG: In connection with the apprenticeship branch, I have had complaints from young apprentices to the effect that some of the courses are unnecessarily long, that they could be telescoped, made shorter, and they would be able to become full-fledged mechanics much earlier than is now demanded of them. With new machinery and better methods of training, etc. they think some of the courses are altogether too long.

HON. MR. DALEY: I would not want to say

whether they are or are not, but I do not think the apprentice is the one to decide that. I will give that matter some consideration.

Vote 98 agreed to.

On Vote 99.

MR. SALSBERG: On Vote 99, boiler inspection, the plumbers and steamfitters unions have been insisting for a number of years on legislation which in their opinion would reduce the number of accidents around steam boilers considerably, and so far the government has not seen fit to enact legislation for which that union has been asking. It seems to me that to go around and inspect steam boilers is necessary, and I have no complaint about it, and I do not know enough to be even critical of the work of that branch, but to go around and inspect steam boilers on the one hand, and on the other allow men who are ill equipped in the opinion of the steamfitters, is not very wise. In London, Ontario, for instance, I was informed that men who are unequipped are continuing to construct and instal some boilers which may blow up, and in some cases they do blow up, and it seems to me to be a very unwise and indefensible policy.

I had occasion when I was in London a year or so ago to be approached by some of these men and they have approached every hon. member who comes from London on this question. He

mentioned a number of instances where boilers exploded because the workmen were untrained and forgot to put in safety valves, and in one instance they mentioned a man's life was almost snuffed out.

It would seem to me to be unwise to refuse these men who are experts and who are asking for legislation, and then on the other hand have untrained men inspect the boilers which we should inspect. We might avoid a number of accidents by making into law the proposals of the Steamfitters Union of London and other parts of this Province.

HON. MR. DALEY: I would like to answer briefly, Mr. Chairman. We have gone into that matter very carefully for several years. The difficulty is to establish a line between a plumber and a steamfitter and I personally wrote to a great many establishments throughout this province where they have both. They probably only have one steamfitter in the employ and many plumbers, and when a boiler is shipped for installation, the blue prints and everything are there and it is really to a large extent a plumbing and pipe-fitting and cutting and threading job.

If you are going to establish that only steamfitters properly qualified could work on the erection of a boiler, then you are going to say that the only people in this province who could ever install a steam plant would be some one from

large plant here in Toronto where they have a number of steamfitters.

You would absolutely eliminate in all the towns where steam plants are being put in which require inspection of their business, if no one could do it except some large steam-fitting contractor. So it does meet with the approval of the people in the business. It is just not a practical thing to do , and the way it is being done at present does not increase accidents one iota. A man who is fully qualified might have forgotten to put in the safety valve, or whatever it was that you said. That is the consideration that we have given to this problem for a long time.

MR. SALSBERG: I am aware the government had this matter before it for some time, but is it not a fact that both the plumbers and the steamfitters who are members of the same union, asked for this?

HON. MR. DALEY: The plumbers want certification too.

Votes 99 to 101 agreed to.

On Vote 102:

MR. SALSBERG: On Vote 102, the hon. minister spoke earlier in the evening about the wage structure in the province of industry as being entirely satisfactory. I want to draw his attention and the attention of the House

to the facts of the situation.

They are not quite as presented by the hon. minister, because while it is true that the income of the industrial worker in the country has increased, the fact is that the Canadian wage earner is about $15 a week, on the average, behind the same group of workers in the United States, and the cost of living is about the same, and the hours of work are slightly shorter in the United States than here.

It does not justify the conclusion that all is well and that there is no room for improvement. The fact is that the 1951 census of this country has shown there are over a quarter of a million male workers in the country who earn less than $500 a year, and another quarter of a million who earn between $500 and $1,000, and 344,000 who earn between $1,000 and $1500, and that the largest single group of over half a million male wage earners who earn between $2,000 and $2500.

I suggest that the wage structure should receive more attention from this government than it has received to the present. Certainly I think the minimum wage law as at present on our books is outmoded , archaic, meaningless, even for female help. I believe it is $16, isn't it, which is a ridiculous minimum to establish.

H ON. MR. DALEY: It is a minimum.

MR. SALSBERG: It is a ridiculously low minimum. I think it is necessary to have a minimum wage for male labour, too, below which no worker should go. There are thousands, tens of thousands of workers who do not enjoy the benefit of trade union protection.

I can point to examples, the same as the hon. Minister, where young boys go into a unionized plant like the Ford Company or General Motors, and because of the union rate they will get a fairly decent wage, but there are tens of thousands who do not have that protection, and for them, I think, a minimum wage of what has been suggested by some people in the trade union movement as one dollar an hour would be a thing to aim at.

I also want to draw the attention of the government, and particularly the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour and his Department to the fact that there are quite a large number of young workers who go to school and who work after school hours and who are paid ridiculous rates, not far removed from the wages I was first paid when I went to work, $3 a week is what I was paid. I was worth a lot more, I assure you. I would like to tell you that my employer gave me a fifty-cent raise without my asking for it, the second week, but I suggest . . . there are many young students who are employed, not merely in drugstores, I am leaving that out for the moment,

but many of them are employed in certain types of businesses. For instance, I have been told of a plant in the west end of the city that specializes in employing students from public and high schools after school hours filling perfume bottles, which may be a fine odorous type of work, but the wages are horribly low, and they work all sorts of hours at night.

(Take II follows)

HON.MR. DALEY: As it is my responsibility to have a check on hours of work, and if you named some firm that is employing children when they should not be employed at night and that sort of thing, I would like to have their names.

MR. SALSBERG: I might say the cases I have in mind are cases on the record of the Board of Education officials of this city, and if the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) would like to see them I will go with him or alone and present these facts. Why do you become so defensive when I am not attacking you or the Government? One of the big troubles with this Government is it always jumps to a defensive position even when they are not attacked. Do not be defensive. I am not even criticizing; I am trying to present a problem to you for your consideration. The Government wants to make it appear as though I invented this, picked it up somewhere and just want to throw it at the Government. I want to assure the hon. Attorney General that when it is a question of throwing things at the Government, there are plenty of other things I have to throw; I do not have to invent things.

I am bringing to the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) a problem which I assure you exists, and ask that some steps be taken

to remedy it and to prevent its continuation.

Vote 102 agreed to.

On Vote 103:

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 103 I want to raise a very serious question, dealing with the lives of people. . It is this Branch, I understand, which is responsible for inspecting, among other things, grain elevators. We have all heard of the tragic explosion which took place at the Head-of-the-Lakes in the grain elevators there causing loss of life, and most serious injuries to other workmen. I should say that is not the first time an explosion has taken place in the grain elevators at the Head-of-the-Lakes. The matter is so serious that, at the Convention of the Ontario Federation of Labour, a demand was made for a Royal Commission to be set up by this Government to investigate conditions in grain elevators throughout the Province, and to make recommendations for legislative action to prevent such tragedies occurring in the future. I have never heard any statement about this. I think it is a serious enough matter to spend a few moments discussing it.

As I said a moment ago, the Ontario Federation of Labour demanded a Royal Commission. I

think we should hear from the hon. Minister of Labour now as to the situation there, and what his opinion is as to the requests of the organized workers of this Province for a Royal Commission to go into this entire matter.

HON. MR. DALEY: Certainly we all regret when we hear of such a terrible thing as the explosion in the elevators at the Head-of-the-Lakes. It was five or six years ago that our Department, because of an explosion which happened around 1944, went very carefully into the inspection of elevators. We had many meetings with the workers, with the management of these elevators and with the engineers and our own staff of engineers, and we devised a set of regulations to control them.

These regulations required the expenditure of, I would think, in all the elevators, many millions of dollars. We found little objection on the part of the elevator operators to comply with our requests. There were delays in getting some things done, such as ventilation systems, as they had to be designed to suit the particular elevators, and dust control and electric wiring, and everything that required attention was included in these regulations, and has been proceeded

with in a substantial manner. We have inspectors who are skilled in that work, and yet in spite of all that we had this explosion.

I cannot say that there was any negligence; an inquest was held, and there did not seem to be blame attached to anybody. It was just one of those things. I can say this to the hon. member for St. Andrew, that we are greatly concerned about it. A great deal of effort and time has been put into improving the conditions, and if you went into them now you would see that vast improvements have been made. The elevators are safer, they are better to work in, and we have done everything that man can think of. If there is something else which can be done, we are working with the engineers and we are endeavouring to remedy this hazard.

However, what can be done which has not been done? I am unable to say. We had a similar explosion in an elevator in Peterborough and our men were up there that very night. I will say this, as far as that elevator goes they have done everything we have asked them to do; they run an excellent show, their housekeeping is good, their dust control is good, and you would think it would be one of the last places to have

an explosion, and yet in some manner it happened. I do not know whether it was a spark from a piece of iron which got into the travelling conveyors or what it was, but something happened and created an explosion. I do not know whether it was carelessness in either case, but, man being what he is, I suppose it will be forever impossible to absolutely eliminate risk.

I assure the hon. member for St. Andrew that we are still working on it, and have done a great deal, with the assistance of the engineers of the elevators and our own people.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am certain the hon. Minister of Labour would like to see the situation cleared up, and I am certain that everyone is anxious to prevent such tragedies from recurring, but I must draw the attention of the Government again to the opinions expressed at that Convention, when they discussed this tragedy which cost the lives of these men. Perhaps with your permission I may read the entire story:

"Ask Commission to Investigate
Grain Elevators

"Windsor, Jan. 18 (Staff).
A Royal commission to investigate conditions in grain elevators throughout the province was requested yesterday by the annual convention of the Ontario Provincial Federation of Labor

(AFL-TLC) as the result of explosions at terminal elevators.

"Special reference was made to the explosion at the Saskatchewan Pool Elevator at Port Arthur last September when six men were killed.

"Cause of the disaster, said the federation, has never been satisfactorily explained,and the 1,500 employees in the industry at the Lakehead are in constant fear of another explosion. The federation added the loss of one grain elevator would seriously interfere with the orderly handling of grain during the rush season.

"The federation asked an investigation into the methods of cleaning tough and damp grain. It charged that the terminal elevators are not properly swept to prevent an explosion's developing into a chain of explosions.

"It suggested that a commission should inquire into reasons why recommendations of the National Protective Fire Association in 1945 were never given effect."

Obviously the workingmen are of the opinion that recommendations made by the National Protective Fire Association were never implemented, and that is serious in itself.

HON. MR. DALEY: That is not so.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know. I am presenting to the House what the responsible spokesmen of Labourhave said, and I would whole-

heartedly support the idea of a Royal Commission. Thousands of men are employed in this occupation, and we have had quite a number of explosions, and I do not think we should explain it by the human factor; the human factor enters into it, but if recommendations of an independent Board were not implemented, then it is more than this human factor; it is almost a crime, it is a criminal offence if anybody is guilty of having failed to implement regulations of such a Board and the result was an explosion which killed six men.

I would urge the Government to agree to a Royal Commission, or undertake its own independent investigation on the basis of the charges made by the spokesmen of the workers in the industry.

Vote 103 agreed to.

Vote 104 agreed to.

Vote 105 agreed to.

On Vote 106:

MR. GORDON: Mr. Chairman, I understand the Office of the Commissioner is concerned with professional and amateur sports, such as wrestling and boxing and so on. I wonder what relationship it has to the recent fatality at Collingwood, when a hockey player was killed.

HON. MR. DALEY: None whatever. The Athletic Commission just supervises boxing and wrestling.

MR. GORDON: What does the Commissioner do? Could you give us some idea?

HON. MR. DALEY: The Athletic Commissioner supervises, as I have already said, boxing and wrestling. He endeavours to see that match making is carried on fairly, that the matches are somewhat equal t so there will not only be a good exhibition but less chance of either of the contestants getting hurt. He weighs them in; he collects a small tax to defray the charges of maintaining this service. I think if any sport needs some regulation, some looking after, it is boxing and wrestling, because they are rough, tough games, and they need some supervision, and that is what the Athletic Commissioner gives them.

Besides that, we do utilize some of the funds which we accumulate from this tax to help out minor and midget teams in other fields of sport -- hockey, baseball and all those things. We supply considerable equipment to these young people's teams all over the Province, with the money we obtain. No matter where boxing

matches are held in the Province they have to have a licence so we know what is going on, and who are fighters are going to be. It is quite easy for a greedy promoter to bring in some outstanding boy and throw some poor, young, inexperienced lad in against him, and probably have very serious results, so the things are supervised, and I think a reasonably good job is being done in that regard.

MR. GORDON: I understand, Mr. Chairman, there is a certain tax and a certain percentage collected, and the amount taken by the Government is a fairly sizeable amount. I was just wondering whether some of that money could not be used for Ontario's part in the next Olympics? Probably it would improve our standing at the next Olympics.

HON. MR. DALEY: It is just about self-supporting, when we give this equipment to the minor teams.

MR. OLIVER: Before you pass the Vote, Mr. Chairman, this Athletic Commission Office is one that has been tossed about considerably these last few years, and it reminds one of the unwanted child. It used to be an office by itself, and then it was put under the Department of Education, and now we find it under the Department of Labour. I feel that the

Athletic Commission should be a more dominant voice in the sports picture in the Province of Ontario; not only should it have supervision over professional boxing and wrestling, but, I believe, that the Athletic Commission, if it is going to be worth while at all, should have as one of its aims the promotion of amateur sports, and, to a degree, the supervision of those sports throughout the Province of Ontario.

I believe in the early days that was the intention, and to a degree the scope of the Athletic Commission, but its activities have been narrowed down these last few years and it now deals, as the hon. Minister of Labour said, almost wholly with professional boxing and professional wrestling.

There is a rumour -- and I suppose it is more than a rumour -- that an appointment is just about to be made to the Athletic Commission, to the position of Chairman, and I believe if there is a Chairman appointed to this Commission he should be a full-time Commissioner; it should be one of the perquisites of his office, one of the requirements of his appointment, that he should not be allowed to have sidelines, but he should spend his talents and his time as

Chairman of the Commission.

I would say to the Government and to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that I believe we could breathe a lot of life into this Athletic Commission by widening its scope and activity to include amateur sport and other lines of sporting activities throughout the Province. As it is now I do not think it is of much account.

(JJ-1 follows)

HON. MR. DALEY: It is doing a good job. Not as extensive as you suggested, but a good job, nevertheless. There has not been a part-time man there for years. Mr. Steele who recently passed away, was on full-time, and has been for twenty years.

MR. OLIVER: Would the hon. Minister say that the man who is to get the appointment in a few weeks, will be on full-time?

HON. MR. DALEY: I would say so.

Votes 106 to 108 inclusive agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with one or two matters before we adjourn, one of which involves the small sums set out in the Supplementary Estimates.

I have been reading some of the papers, and I have no doubt the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) tomorrow will say, "Well, if you did not have these Supplementary Estimates, you would have a surplus of $50 million". That is correct.

But in the Supplementary Estimates there is an item of $10 million going into highways in addition to the $20 million voted last fall, which makes a total of $30 million. What we are asking the House to do is to vote that money. The question is, do we need the money? Why, of course we do. Let me ask the hon. members opposite if we need

$8½ million for hospitals? If you do not think so, do not vote the money, and we will add $8½ million to our surplus. But, do we need the money? Of course we do. I am sure the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) will be the first to say, "Of course we do". The hon. member (Mr. Grummett) might like me to rise in my place and say, "We have a $50 million surplus", and then he would go out and harpoon us around the country. I came to this House with a surplus of $67,000, but if the hon. members do not want to vote $8½ million for hospitals, we will have an added $8½ million surplus.

Then, for the teachers' superannuation fund $1 million. Do we need that money? Of course we do. Would any of the hon. members in considering the vote for universities, say that we do not need that money? We could have a $2 million additional surplus, if you cut that off. I may say, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. members want to cut all of these things off, we can have a $50 million surplus. Of course, we can.

And I would say to the hon. members if they want to take $25 million in the Estimates set aside for welfare and for old age pensions, and cut those off, then we could have another $25 million surplus.

If the hon. members want to cut off $45

million we have in the Estimates for health, we can have a $45 million surplus. It would be easy to have a large surplus, if we cut these items off.

Do we need the $30 million for highways? Of course we do. Do we need the money for hospitals, for the teachers' superannuation fund and the universities? Of course we do. That is why I am asking the House to vote the Supplementary Estimates, and when we are through, the money will be given for needed things, and we will end up with a surplus of $67,000.

Vote 205 agreed to.

Vote 206 agreed to.

Vote 207 agreed to.

Vote 208 agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may we consider the Estimates of the Lieutenant-Governor's office, the Provincial Auditor, and miscellaneous. They are small items, and I would like to dispose of them tonight.

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 70, Vote 120 agreed to.

Page 80, Vote 142.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask whether it would not be wise, -- in my opinion it would -- to have the Provincial Auditor assume the responsibility of auditing the books of Hydro. As I learned, Hydro is audited by an outside

firm, I understand, as the result of an order-in-council appointing them, and I see no reason why we should engage an outside auditing firm to audit the books of so important a provincial commission as The Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission. It would require quite a staff, but we all have confidence in the Provincial Auditor and his staff, and I think they could acquire the necessary help to assume this new responsibility. I think the people of the province would feel much better if that procedure were followed, instead of leaving it to an outside firm.

I want to make it abundantly clear that I am not casting any aspersions on the firm now auditing the books of Hydro. I take it for granted they are a very responsible organization, but despite their excellence and their record and their reputation, I, for one, as a member of this House, feel that the auditing of Hydro should be the responsibility of the Provincial Auditor.

It is similar to the city of Toronto, where the City Auditor audits all the commissions' books, whether it is the Harbor Commission, or any other city-established commission, which operates in the city of Toronto. They report to City Council, and I think we should follow their example. I think it is

a good idea, and I would like to hear from the hon. Prime Minister whether he favours the idea, or wants to give it some consideration.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member that in principle, I am inclined to agree. If it were not for the magnitude of the task, I think there would be very much to be said for it. At times, I ask the Provincial Auditor to examine into certain things in which we are interested, and to interpret them to us. But, as the hon. member knows, it is a tremendous job. Our services here have grown in the last nine years from, roughly, a $100 million Budget to about a $350 million Budget. I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that most of the money has come from the expansion and development of the province and the betterment of the services which we give to the people, which enable us, in the end, to give the people more benefits.

However, considering the magnitude of the provincial affairs, it has been a very great job for the Provincial Auditor with his staff, in these days, when it is difficult to get staff, to keep pace with it.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that two or three years ago, we had the Provincial Auditor audit the

books of the Ontario Northland Railway, and, to be frank, I think it is a good idea to extend those services wherever possible, but to extend them to an audit of the Hydro books, at least under present conditions, is almost a physical impossibility.

MR. OLIVER: The books of the Liquor Control Board would be in much the same category?

HON. MR. FROST: That has been suggested at times. The Liquor Control Board's books are audited by a firm in London, I think. In any event, it is difficult to take up these things all at once. It will have to be done gradually. With the opening of the new Treasury building, where things will be more streamlined, where we shall have more space, and more machines, perhaps the matter may again be considered.

MR. OLIVER: Are the books of the Ontario Northland Railway now audited by the Provincial Auditor?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, and we will extend it to other services when we can do so, but it takes personnel and it takes space. As a matter of fact, the space in this building, from an office standpoint, is anything but satisfactory. I was going down Bay Street the other day and I noticed one of the modern office buildings, where the staff is all

on one floor, --

MR. OLIVER: Why do you not buy it?

HON. MR. FROST: I am so busy building hospitals and other things, that I cannot do that at the moment.

Vote 142 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 106, "Miscellaneous".

Vote 203 agreed to.

Vote 204 agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions, and begs leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that tomorrow afternoon, we will proceed with the Budget Debate. I would ask the hon. members of the House to remember how this $67,000 surplus was arrived at, when the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) proceeds to take us apart. I think the money this year has been very

wisely voted.

I would also like to go into the second Part -- Part II -- of the Toronto Bill as soon as possible, and if there is any time left tomorrow, we may proceed with that part of the Toronto Bill.

There will be no night session tomorrow night, but we may have to have one on Wednesday. If there is any change, I will let the hon. members know at 3 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:34 of the clock,p.m.

- - - - - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session

of the

Twenty-Fourth Legislature

of the

Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XXIV

Tuesday, March 17, 1953.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1953, ET SEQ.

Hon (Rev.) J. C. Davies,
Speaker,

- - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Tuesday, March 17, 1953.
3:00 o'clock, p.mm.

And the House having met.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: As is the custom, the Legislature welcomes today the students from the School of Nursing and Regent Park Public School and the Presbyterian Missionary School in the West Gallery. Acton Public School Glen Rush Public School and the Ontario Ladies College all are in the East Gallery. This is a particularly auspicious occasion, being as it is the 17th of March.

Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the fifth annual report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills and move its adoption.

CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Nickle from the Standing

Committee on Private Bills presents its Fifth Report as follows:

"Your Committee begs to report the following Bill with a certain amendment:

"Bill No. 15, An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

"Your Committee would recommend that the following Bills be not reported, the petitioners having requested that they be withdrawn and Your Committee would further recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted:

"Bill No. 3, An Act respecting The Young Men's Christian Association of St. Catharines.

"Bill No. 4, An Act respecting The Young Women's Christian Association of St. Catharines.

"Your Committee would recommend that the following Bills be not reported.

"Bill No. 7, An Act respecting the Town of Paris.

"Bill No. 11, An Act respecting the Town of Hespeler.

"All of which is respectfully submitted.

Toronto, March 17, 1953.

(Signed) W. M. Nickle,
Chairman."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

LAND TITLES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Land Titles Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: These amendments are of a technical nature, and I would suggest that this Bill be referred to the Legal Bills Committee in due course.

In the first place section 23 of the Land Titles Act which provides that all registered lands as expressed on the Register are subject to certain liabilities and interest. There are certain statutory liabilities which are not covered by the wording of that section and this is designed as a cure.

It also provides for the filing of plans on an order of a judge of a county or district court, and the provisions are the same as in the Registry Act, and this will bring them into line with that Act.

Also there is a provision where a fee collected is beyond a certain amount, that a maximum fee be established.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. W. J. Dunlop (Minister of Education) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Public Schools Act".

Motion agreed to, first reading of the Bill.

He said: This Bill in the first place defines occasional teachers, permanent teachers and probationary teachers. It goes on to include the clause which has already been proposed for the High Schools Act and the Department of Education Act, defining holidays in schools.

It then goes on to deal with the formation

of township school areas, indicating when certain school sections may withdraw from an area, and other school sections may enter an area, and it deals also with the method of election of public school trustees.

TEACHERS SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. W. J. Dunlop (Minister of Education) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Teachers Superannuation Act."

Motion agreed to, first reading of the Bill.

He said: This Bill undertakes to rectify some inequalities in the present Teachers Superannuation Act such as to enable some of our teachers, when called upon to do so, to teach for a little while in foreign countries. Some of them are now in Abyssinia in while there they are to be allowed to contribute to the superannuation fund.

It also provides for people who attended a second year normal school course in earlier days and lost a year in contribution on that account, we are restoring that privilege to them.

There was a clause in the present Act which provided for refunding contributions only to those who had taught for five years or more. This seems to be rather an inequality and it is proposed now that if a teacher has taught for more than twenty days and retires from the profession, his or her contributions may be refunded.

There is also the repeal of a section which place a ceiling on the pensions that could be earned, and lastly it clears up a number of matters which seem to be not quite fair to the teachers in the present Act.

THE PLANNING ACT

Hon. W. K. Warrender (Minister of Planning and Development) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An act to amend the Planning Act".

Motion agreed to, first reading of the Bill.

He said: There are two or three small amendments here which I shall explain to the hon. members. On Section 12 it is proposed to amend that to enable citizens who wish to amend a plan to have it done even though a council may stand in the way. We have had some cases where council have refused to take any action at all, and under this proposed amendment they may be forced into action under this procedure.

Under section 13 it is proposed here to speed up the present procedure. Sometimes a council passes an amending by-law and later it must go to the Minister which all takes time. Now it is proposed that the amending by-law and the approval of the Minister are both done concurrently.

Under section 15 there is a provision where a municipality in a planning area consisting

of more than one municpality which has not appointed a subsidiary planning board should be able to do so. In other words this is a provision to set up a committee apart from the planning board.

Section 16, subsection (a): this is an amendment to the re-development section which is of some interest locally, because Toronto to date is the only municipality which has set aside an area as a re-development area. Here it is proposed that if a municipality which designates an area as a re-development area and then does nothing for a long while to the detriment of the citizens in the surrounding area, that certain action can be taken to have the Council go ahead with re-development plans or else get out of the picture and have the area put back in its former status.

There is an amendment to section 24 which is an effort to get around a little scheme which has been worked out by certain persons whereby they sell an area of land less than ten acres in metes and bounds and the scheme is that "A" sells to "B" an area larger than ten acres and then "B" reconveys almost all of that area back to "A", leaving a small area of less than ten acres, and since it is the only piece of land he has left he may, under a section of the Planning Act, sell it but not according to a plan of

metes and bounds. In other words he evades the intent of the Planning Act, and this amendment will cure that.

There is another small amendment to Section 26 whereby certain additional information is required under Planning Areas.

LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS ACT

Hon. George H. Dunbar moved first reading of the Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Local Improvements Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: This amendment provides that a local improvement rate must be levied at the latest in the year following the year in which the local improvement work was completed. Some clerks are lax in their duty and let it stand over for a number of year which is very undesirable.

THE MUNICIPAL SUBSIDIES ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1953.

Hon. George H. Dunbar (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "The Municipal Subsidies Adjustment Act, 1953."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: This is where the Act permitted the different departments affected to buy in an annexed area, the same rate of grant that had been levelled and was prevailing in the annexed area

such as Ottawa, Kingston and Sarnia, and those places where they annexed a portion of the land and were allowed the same rate of 50 per cent for a five-year period, and then for another ten-year period one-half of that each year.

This is not necessary because the Fire and Police Act is being changed this year. Instead of paying the percentage of the Fire and Police, they will be getting the municipalites per capita grant.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. George H. Dunbar (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: There are several sections changed in the Municipal Act here and it will be taken to the Committee of Municipal Law and considered there after second reading, so that every person will have an opportunity before it goes out, and there is nothing which affects the government in any way, so that the members of the Committee are free to vote on it as they wish

THE SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Frost (Prime Minister) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "AnAct to amend the Succession Duties Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

(Take B follows)

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill was outlined in the Budget. I wanted to complete the record before the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) spoke.

CORPORATION TAX ACT

Hon. L. M. Frost moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Corporation Tax Act".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CORPORATION AND INCOME TAXES SUSPENSION ACT, 1952

Hon. L. M. Frost moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Corporation and Income Taxes Suspension Act, 1952",

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Prime Minister care to give us the usual explanation about this usual Bill?

HON. MR. FROST: These Bills were outlined in the Budget last week. They arose out of the tax adjustments which were announced last Thursday, and were all covered at that time.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, there are some Irish members of the Legislature who wish to recognize the occasion.

HON. L. M. FROST: In connection with this very important matter, and being of Scottish extraction, I am greatly honoured today by having this pot of shamrock placed on my desk, and the boutonniere which was presented to me by my good friend and namesake, the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Frost), and I thank him very much. This is the first occasion I recall of being so honoured. It may be because of the fact that my father for many years was prominent in the public life of Orillia, and was born on the 17th of March. He made quite a day out of it in the affairs of that city, and never hesitated to tell people that he was born on the 17th of March, and it became quite prominent in our household.

This may also be because my wife is an unadulterated Irish girl. I would say that she being the brains and influential member of the family, no doubt this pot of shamrock was presented on that account, and I certainly will do as I always do when anything is given to me, take it home and give it to my wife.

I also received -- as did all the hon. members -- a pocket handkerchief, and I notice it was made in Ireland. I thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for that. I wondered a little

about the handkerchief and just why it was given to the Government hon. members of the House, and it occurs to me it may be that we will require this on account of the severe castigation we are about to receive this afternoon from the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

I wish to thank you very much for your thoughtfulness and kindness, coming as it did from the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) on St. Patrick's Day.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I can add very little to what the hon. Prime Minister has already said except, as a true Irishman, being thrilled to find you sitting in Mr. Speaker's Chair on this occasion, and I would like to add my thanks to you, and to the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. A. Frost) for your gifts on this occasion.

This is a day revered by true Irishmen throughout the world, and I am sure our Scotch friends are very envious of us on this occasion.

MR. D. McM. KERR (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I would like on behalf of my fellow Irishmen, to accept the words of praise which have been offered to them on this occasion.

I was reading just recently a speech made

by one of the visitors to the Imperial Council of the Commonwealth of Nations, made at Ottawa, where he boasted there has not been an L.P.P. in the Irish Parliament, and one of the reasons given was not that they did not have any of them, but they did not have enough to even nominate them.

MR. SALSBERG: You are misinformed.

MR. KERR: I do not think it is misinformation at all. There has never been a member of that Party sitting in any Irish Parliament, which is more than could be said concerning a great many other parliaments. I think they have too much sense, over there.

On this day, which is the most important day in an Irishman's life, we rever the memory of one who did not hesitate to mix religion with politics, and found in the shamrock pot, the great story of the Trinity. He declared the brotherhood of man as being an essential, and maintained this principle in all his teachings.

We who have followed, while realizing we are living in a different atmosphere, find that these principles still hold good, and on behalf of my fellow Irishmen in the province of Ontario, I want to say that we will always be, as we have been in the past, loyal to the Crown, to the Queen, and

to constitutional law.

HON. MR. KELLY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to add a few words, I would like to join with the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. members who have preceded me in thanking you for the gifts you have placed upon our desks this afternoon.

May I say to the hon. members of this House who are of Scottish descent, that while they claim St. Patrick was a Scotsman, I think it is well established that he was Irish, and I would like to point out it was because of, rather than in spite of, his association with the Irish people that he became a Knight.

My forebears came from County Kerry in Ireland, and they will have met in that County this morning, as they have done for the past 1500 years, and spread the message of St. Patrick, to all the world, which I will give to you now, "God rest all here".

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how you can call a man an Irishman with the good Scottish name of "Gordon", but I happened to be born in Dublin, and by that, I think I can claim to be Irish, although it does not make me an Irishman. My father was a Scotch Heilan'man, but I had the honour of being born in Ireland.

MR. A. FROST (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have had the privilege of decorating the desk of the hon. Prime Minister with the nearest thing to the real shamrock there is in Canada at the present time. I do not want to get into any controversy. There are many kinds of shamrocks and everyone seems to have a different opinion as to which is the real shamrock. You will see on your desks, five different varieties of shamrocks, and if you follow these through, you will find some have pink flowers, some have red, some have yellow, some grow like clover -- which is the real shamrock -- whereas the others are not, but are what we call "oxalis".

MR. J. W. HANNA (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I would be remiss if I did not say something about this great St. Patrick's Day. May I assure you that it gives me great happiness to see so many good looking Irishmen in this House, and may I say that my great grandfather has a very fine monument in the city of Belfast, a city I visited some years ago. He was called the "Fighting Hanna" or "Black Hanna" but as an Irishman today, I am proud to be associated with those who commemorate the memory of St. Patrick.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the day, I would like to acknowledge the very fine plant on my own desk, presented to me by those members of my own riding association.

Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: I beg to table answers to question No. 2.

(PAGE B-8 FOLLOWS)

SPEECH ON THE BUDGET

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I think we might have had a more enjoyable afternoon if we had continued extolling the virtues of the Irishmen and Ireland.

I would like, in the first instance, to pay my respects to Mr. Speaker, and to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, personally. I think it is most appropriate you should occupy the Chair of Mr. Speaker on the 17th day of March. As you know, I have ever held a very, very high regard indeed for you personally, and am particularly pleased that it should be you who is presiding over the deliberations this afternoon, to keep me on the straight and narrow path, as I am sure you will. I do not pay these respects out of custom, but entirely out of inclination, but there may be another reason, and that is because I have always considered it the very greatest honour which could come to any good citizen of this province to occupy a seat in this Legislature, and have the pleasure of paying respects

to Mr. Speaker. As I look back over the years -- some 34 in number now -- and consider the scores of splendid members, all better than your humble servant, who have come and gone, and take into account, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy) who, for some reason or other, whether by virtue of the frailties of the flesh, or advancing years, or perhaps the hope of helping to elect George Drew in Ottawa, felt compelled to resign his Portfolio of Agriculture. I was pleased to see today he was back with us, looking more healthy and better than ever. I was sorry to hear that his successor, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, is suffering from illness, and I trust he will soon return completely restored to good health.

As I view these matters, I sometimes wonder when the law of averages or even the law itself is going to catch up to your humble servant, Mr. Speaker, and I may "turn up missing" at one of these sessions, and not able to pay my respects to the Chair, and in that respect -- and here the hon. Prime Minister may get out his handkerchief -- I wonder if the immortal words of Thomas Moore may not begin to apply to me,

" When I remember all
The friends, so link'd together,

I've seen around me fall,
Like leaves in wintry weather;
I feel like one,
Who treads alone
Some banquet-hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled,
Whose garlands dead,
And all but he departed!"

I may not be quite accurate in my quotation, and I am sure it will be in order for the hon. Minister of Education to correct it on Hansard, as it is a number of years ago since I memorized it in school, and the words at that time did not have the same significance as they do today.

Before I enter upon -- may I say -- some cursory remarks on the Budget, I would like to deal with a matter pertaining to my own county of Brant. Sometimes it is difficult to find the proper place at which to bring these matters before the Legislature, but you, Mr. Speaker, are most generous in your interpretation of the rules of discussion in these open debates, and you have allowed considerable latitude, and I would ask you to confer that upon me now.

---Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. NIXON: I want to bring to the attention of the House, one characteristic of the historic riding of Brant -- and you will notice I did not say

the "best riding" in the province, because I have the honour of representing a portion of the splendid counties of Oxford and Norfolk.- One of the greatest aspects of the county of Brant is the very large Indian population on the reserve in the township of Tuscarora.

The names of Brantford City and Brantford Township were given in memory and honour of a great Indian, Joseph Brant, who brought his tribe of Six Nation Indians here at the time of the American War of Independence. At the same time, my own great grandfather came to Canada with the United Empire Loyalists. These Indians had been very patriotic, and had fought for His Majesty and Empire, but like my own forefathers, they found they were not very popular in the United States when the war was over and were forced to leave, and came to Canada. At that time, King George III made a very substantial grant of land to the Indians, the Six Nation of the Iroquois clan, consisting of a strip of land six miles wide on each side of the Grand River, from its mouth to its source.

Joseph Brant very quickly disposed -- very unwisely, in my opinion -- of a large part of this land. In fact, my forebear came there, and for a few pounds, purchased the farm on which I am living

today. Brant soon had the Indians backed up into the small area comprising Tuscarora Township.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is a very large Indian reservation. There are over 6,000 on their records, not all of whom live in Tuscarora; many of them work in Buffalo, Brantford, Hamilton, and on the surrounding farms, but their records show 6,000 individuals.

This reservation has produced some very famous people, Mr. Speaker, besides Joseph Brant. This includes the great Indian poetess, Pauline Johnson, whose poetry and prose constitute a great record of Indian lore, and reflects great credit upon her people. Other famous people have come from that reservation. I think a Brigadier, who is now occupying a high position in the public service of this province came from the reservation, and many, many hundreds served with great distinction in two wars. We have also had those who made great contributions to science, to music, and to the professions, and a number of the world's greatest athletics.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, they are a very, very fine people indeed. They did me a great honour some years ago of making me an Indian Chief, with a name which is quite unpronounceable, but which in

effect means "trees of equal height", or perhaps a more literal interpretation would be "all men look alike to me , the little man the same as the big man". I assure you I was greatly flattered to have such a name, but it is a very difficult one to live up to.

It is not very often my good friends on the reserve have requested anything of me, but this session, they have asked me to bring a matter to the attention of the House, which I would like to do on this occasion.

There was recently passed in Ottawa a new Indian Act of 1951 after a great deal of consideration and discussion by the tribes. There is a provision in that Act for the franchise to be extended to Indians under very special circumstances, which are set out in a number of sections, and provide that on the report of the Minister, an Indian who applied for enfranchisement, and is qualified, will be enfranchised by an order-in-council, and will subsequently have the right to vote.

The only Indians so far who have voted in provincial elections are those who have served in His Majesty's forces -- I think it was His Majesty's forces, during the elections of the past, but, of course, in the future, it will be in Her Majesty's forces. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it would be wise for

this Legislature to extend the franchise to the same Indians who are enfranchised by the Federal Government, which has to deal with these issues, in the first instance. If we attempted to extend it any further, it might cause some confusion. Many of the Indians do not desire a vote, but those who do wish to vote, I think should be permitted to declare their wish.

There is another matter they have asked me to present to this Legislature, and that is, the provisions of Section 95 of the Indian Act,

Some weeks ago, I placed on the Order Paper, a question as follows:

> "Has the Government of Ontario taken any action or given any consideration to bringing the Indians of this province within the provision of subsection 2 of Section 95 of the Indian Act, re the consumption of alcoholic beverages."

This Section says:

> "The provision making the drinking of intoxicating beverages is local except as provided by the laws of the province. This Section shall not come into force in any province until proclaimed in that province, and will be brought into force at the request of the Lieutenant-Governor of the province."

The Indian Council at a recent meeting, passed this resolution addressed to the Government.

I do not know whether it has been received as yet, but in any case, this is the first petition I have ever known to come from the Indians in my 35 years in this Legislature, and I would ask that careful consideration be given to it:

> "That the members of the Six Nation band of Indians be allowed the privilege of patronizing beverage rooms in the province of Ontario, as provided for in Section 95 (1) (2) of the Indian Act, Chapter 29, Statutes of Canada, 1951"

I leave that matter for the consideration of the Government.

I had a delegation wait upon me some time ago, asking me to bring this matter to the attention of the Government, and one very eminent gentlemen said that when he on a Saturday afternoon, with his wife, went into a hotel beverage room and the proprietor thinking there might be an inspector there, would shake his head and make a motion for them to leave, he said, "It makes me feel like a second-hand citizen". I think we can all appreciate these very fine people are entitled to consideration under the provisions of the Act.

If I may read a paragraph from a letter from David Croll, the member at Ottawa, who furnished me with a copy of the Federal Act, it contains this

information:

> "I am informed by the Department that British Columbia and Nova Scotia have already given their approval, and they find there is far less difficulty now than they formerly encountered due to intoxication."

I want to extend my congratulations to all of those who spoke in the previous debate. I think the speeches were of a very high order, and I thoroughly enjoyed them all. I was going to make reference to the address by the mover of the reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Nickle). I have always taken a particular interest in the three hon. members of the House whose fathers have preceded them and with whom I sat in years gone by, whom I saw come in, and whom I have seen go out, and I am always wanting to see how these new hon. members "stack up" against their old Dads.

I was particularly interested in observing the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) because his father was for many years in Opposition, and later sat on the Government side, as the Attorney-General of the province.

I sometimes think it is strange how issues change a man's political life in this Legislature. Everything was going along smoothly, and we had one

of the most able Attorneys-General the province has ever had, certainly in my day, and he did splendid work. But then an issue arose which was not new, but one with which this House has had to deal for many, many years, and I still remember the discussions on the Budget in those days, although they were concerned then only with a matter of a very few million dollars, mere chicken feed, but they still had the old question of liquor.

The province had the Ontario Temperance Act, and the people were becoming very restive, and Mr. Ferguson, who headed the Conservative Party, let it be known that if he were returned to power, something would be done about it. He was returned to power, but what was to be done about it was the next order of business.

So the Attorney-General of that day, Mr. Nickle, came up with the answer, and that answer was 4.4 beer. The Attorney-General said it would be delightful, refreshing, stimulating -- I cannot think of all the adjectives he applied, but certainly those were three of them, and the House, after many days of debate, passed the legislation, and the beer came on to the market, but it appeared that no matter how great an Attorney-General, nor how great a lawyer Mr. Nickle was, he certainly was not a good

judge of beer, and the public did not agree with his description. In fact, they thought it was not even good "hog-wash".

So Mr. Ferguson said he was tired of being a hypocrite, and was going to bring down the policy of hard liquor under license and beer by the glass, The beer by the glass came in, but it remained for the Government of which I was a member to bring in the hard liquor. However, after the election, we did not see Mr. Nickle, Sr. in this House again, which was a very great loss to the province.

I feel that his worthy son will not make the same mistake his father did. It may be that he is a better judge of beer, but the issues are quite different, and I anticipate in the next shuffle of the Cabinet Chairs, I think he will be found seated on the Treasury benches, and I am sure will add great lustre to the Government of which he may be a part.

He made a very fine speech in the debate, and mentioned that travelling through Europe, he found that no matter in which country he was, they took the Canadian money at par and were glad to get it.

(TAKE C FOLLOWS)

Some of us encountered the same thing, with possibly less expense, by travelling through the United States during this last year when our Canadian funds were at 5 per cent premium, and we could send an order for ten dollars over to the United States, pay it with a ten-dollar bill, add the cost of sending an order and still have some change in our pockets. That is quite different from a few years ago when every morning I would sit beside an American at the Hotel who would pay for his breakfast with a ten-dollar bill and get ten dollars back in change.

Yes, we have a great government in this country of Canada which has so well administered our affairs that the currency of Canada is the best currency in the world.

The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) will be working alongside of us in the election which is surely to come in a very few months, we were told yesterday, to see that this good government is returned.

Not only have they made our currency so good, they have reduced taxes on cigarettes and on income; they have abolished the stamp tax, the radio tax, the security transfer tax and they have used their surplus of $48 million -- a very modest surplus this year - in the reduction of debt. But over the longer picture they have used large surpluses in the past in the reduction of

debt, and have put their finances in such good shape that they could also reduce taxes. Starting in 1946 with a debt of thirteen and a half billion dollars they now have it down to $11,137,000,000, a reduction of nearly two and a half billion dollars. That is certainly a very creditable record, indeed, and one that this government of course has not attempted to follow.

Among the praises that have been showered upon the Federal Government for the splendid record, in addition to the unintentional one from the hon. member for Kingston (Mr.Nickle), we have one from Mr. Robert Taft from Ohio:

> "We ought to follow their example of cutting expenses so that we, too, can cut taxes. They have been able to reduce taxes because they have held expenses down."

An old friend, Mr. Peter McDonald,F.C.I.S., vice-president and secretary of the Crown Life Insurance Company,after returning from a world trip, speaking in Hamilton, said that:

> "On a recent trip around the world he found that Canada's balanced budget and economic progress were the envy and admiration of people everywhere."

Then I have this gem right from the Emerald Isle, from the Dublin Irish Independent:

> "The Government has steadily followed a policy of directing investment into strictly productive channels. It has refrained from widespread increases in its own expenditure, It has adjusted taxation on business so that companies are encouraged to plow back their earnings."

Finally I would like the hon. Provincial Treasurer to pay attention to this:

> "Finally it has recognized that the taxpayer is better able to use his money than even the most energetic minister. It has therefore adopted the reduction of taxation as a goal of policy.
>
> "When one comes to think of it, all these ideals can be pursued in other countries besides Canada and they do not seem to have done the Canadians any harm."

In referring more directly to the budget that was laid on the table last Thursday by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr.Frost) I certainly want to congratulate him on his good health-- that is physically, Mr. Speaker -- he seems to thrive under the cares of office. Of course I would not congratulate him on his political good health, I would much rather see him occupying this chair and speaking as opposition critic of the Budget as he did for many years in the past, and he made a very able job of it, indeed, and I can just imagine how he would wax eloquent over the astronomical figure of expenditure that we have in these days of between $90 million and $100 million. What he could do with these figures was something to marvel at. What he would do to the figure of $640 million expenditure that we have outlined in the estimates would really be worth hearing.

I congratulate him on his good physical health. I do not know that I quite approve of the new method of presenting the Budget to the House, where he simply laid this great document on the table, the document that his able staff had been over a year in preparing, and without even opening the first page he laid it on the table and then proceeded to deliver a political speech, which, of course, gave his followers in the House every opportunity to cheer and whack the desks, whereas if he had confined himself to the usual procedure and read out the statement of debt, they would not have had so many opportunities to applaud.

So that I think we might another time get back to the old method of presenting the budget wherein the finance minister does describe the statement and gives a picture of the debt, of the tax increase, or decrease as the case may be.

I did notice in the Press that our present Treasurer, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has spent more money in his time in office of ten years than all the previous treasurers of Ontario, extending over a period of seventy-seven years. I have not checked this with my own work, but I have the figure of $2 billion, but I would certainly say if he has not spent

more he certainly has spent a lot, and if you, Mr.Speaker, were not there watching my parliamentary language I would make it even more emphatic.

In addition to spending almost $2 billion, he has signed notes for $7 million in addition to guaranteeing the debentures of Hydro and other bodies in the province.

Well, I hope the Province never has to pay for any of these guaranteed debentures. From my own limited personal experience in backing another fellow's notes it has not been so happy and I had to stop the practice some time ago, or I would have been after the Treasurer to back my note before this. So we will hope for the best regarding the $7,600,000,000 debt which may be added to our obligations, which is a very serious factor.

The next year's estimates, as I have said, total $460,812,000. That money has to be paid by the people some time, if it is not going to be on the over-all plan for this year, it will be added to the gross debt, and will have to be paid by future generations. I submit this debt is piling up to a rather formidable figure as it is.

As we read in Hansard the hon. Prime Minister's speech I do not know how

often he repeated, "We are giving," or "We have given", or, "We gave" and "We propose to give". I think he repeated that at least fifty or sixty times and I was under the impression that all this money was coming right out of his own pocket when he gave it with such generosity. But the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) let it "out of the bag" the other day when he said you have to collect it from the people before you can give it back. So that really you are not entitled to a great deal of credit in simply taking it out of one pocket and putting it into another, and I would remind you again of this wise saying from Ireland, "That the Taxpayer is better able to use his money than even the most energetic minister." And I would like to see a little money left in the hands of the taxpayer to give him a chance to try his luck at spending it.

I am always interested in seeing how good a guesser the Treasurer is. He usually forecasts every year as to what amount of money we will take in, and the first thing I do when I get the auditors' statement is to see how far wide of the mark he actually was. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that this auditor's report that we have received in recent years is a document of very great interest and value, indeed. It is filled with a great deal of information,

pertinent information, and when I want to check up on some of the older reports in the library, I saw there was absolutely nothing in them but a list of Treasury warrants and special warrants and no information that was of any interest. I think the Auditor is to be congratulated in laying on the table such an interesting and complete report, and possible some credit is due to a former member for Waterloo North, Mr. John Brown, who as a chartered accountant gave a good deal of attention to this matter.

In ordinary revenue of a year ago, the actual revenue over the budget forecast was $45,950,000, or $46 million, so that we are not improving very much in forecasting, when you forecast no closer than $46 million, and this year, of course, was an all-time figure with a revenue of $50 million more than was forecast.

When I came into this House first we were debating budgets of nineteen and twenty million dollars and here we have a budget with $50 million more collected from the people in taxes than the Treasurer himself expected to get, and he never even mentioned that fact in the Budget speech, but just laid the document on the table. So that we find the forecasting of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is not improving any, but on the other hand it is even getting worse.

To take a little look at this budget that the hon. Provincial Treasurer even declined to open when he placed it on the table, the revenue is $354 million. The anticipated revenue is $304 million, so the people were overtaxed by $50,500,000. I am not going to quarrel with the hon. Prime Minister this afternoon as to whether there is a $760,000 surplus or whether it should be a $50 million surplus. You can get your views from different sources and none of them seems to agree.

HON. MR. FROST: I would like to say to the hon. member that last night when he was away they voted that surplus away and it left $76,000.

MR. NIXON: You can let the tail go with the hide as far as I am concerned. I have suggested before and I suggest again this having a surplus of $76,000 rests entirely with your system of bookkeeping. You can dump as much as you like into your debt requirement fund, and if that begins to fill up you have the highway reserve fund now that you can dump untold millions into, so that instead of taking these figures arrived at in an arbitrary way, let us have a surplus of one dollar.

I am not a lawyer, thank goodness, but I understand a document is legal when it mentions one dollar when a transaction takes place, so let us have a surplus of one dollar.

Certainly,as the hon. Prime Minister said a couple of years ago, he was entitled to have a million-dollar surplus and he has now brought it down to $76,000. As the hon. Prime Minister ha said even with the additional fifty and one-half million dollars that came in they have spent it all and we have only $76,000 left as a surplus.

That reminds me of an incident in this House several years ago when the hon. Dr. McDonald was provincial treasurer in the Ferguson government,and he delivered a budget here one day and gave advance copies to the members of the Press, and delivered his budget as was his custom without referring to a note. One of the interesting highlights was when he said "We have the money and we spend it. It is the natural thing to do." When I was criticizing it I said I entirely agreed with him that it was the natural thing to spend all the money, in fact I find that my own children when they received a little money could not wait until it was spent. They really took me to task when I arrived home, for embroiling them in our political squabbles down here and I suggested to the Treasurer this might be a wise thing to save a little of it and pay off some of the debts or reduce taxation. It is interesting to note that while that statement appears in the release to the Press and was certainly

said in the House, you will not find it in the Budget speech in the Library today, because Mr. Ferguson had it expunged from the record of the Treasurer's speech, and it was not long before the Treasurer himself was expunged.

There is one advantage in being both Prime Minister and Treasurer, at least you cannot be expunged for what you say in that way, and it is only when the long-suffering taxpayer of this Province catches up to the Government and its spendthrift habits, that they will again turn to the Liberal party as they have done in the past to put the house in order in this Province. We are here waiting and ready to do so. We did it once and we can do it again.

There are some very interesting items in this Budget that I am sure might be brought to the attention of the House very briefly. I have already referred to the total revenues and a few of the items. The highways, for instance, shows that $99 million, and next year they forecast $96 million. I do not know why you should anticipate any less revenue there. Then the Department of Lands and Forests: What has happened to Lands and Forests? A few years ago as you know, we were budgeting for a deficit in Lands and Forests, and in another year for a surplus of $16,000. I brought to the attention of the House that it

was absurd that the Treasurer of this Province should not have some net revenue out our great forest resources and the revenue that accrues from all the licences that they receive, I said that years ago when the price of wood products was merely a percentage of what it is today, we used to get $3 million and $4 million, and the Treasurer said, "Oh, you milked the lands and forests. As far as we are concerned we do not want their money and they can plow it all back in." But here we have a revenue of $20,500,000 and an expenditure of $11,600,000 and a tidy net surplus turned over of $9 million.

HON. MR. FORST: I want to please the hon. member.

MR. NIXON: I am certainly pleased. I do not know what commission I should receive as an expert adviser to the Government, but after all, $9 million is not to be sneezed at and I submit you should have been getting it for several years before you did.

Of course our advice is so seldom taken that I feel it is almost not worth while offering it, but I am glad to note that in this instance it was done, it was a little drastic in the reorganization of a department, but the hon. Provincial Treasurer has received this very substantial sum of $9 million. Why should it be reduced in the estimates for next year by

$4 million? I should think the Government could keep up the good work.

We have the Liquor Board with $42,750,000 in transfer fees and only $36,000,000 forecast for the next year. Are people not going to drink themselves into prosperity again, or is it possible the Government is going to take the water out of the liquor this year, and for that reason there will not be so much profit coming to the Province.

HON. MR. FROST: I did not put it in. It was the government of the hon. member that put it in.

MR. NIXON: Maybe it is time to take it out now.

In this connection again I am always a little intrigued by the reference of the hon. Provincial Treasurer to the Liquor Board in accounts receivable, $10,200,000. This is the net total of accounts receivable of all Departments of the Province of Ontario. It includes $6,535, 000 representing the surplus of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario less a provision for revenue stabilization.

Last year the money that was left to the Liquor Board for revenue stabilization was $14,600,000, and if I interpret this rightly that is increased this year by an additional amount of money left with the Liquor Board which

owes the province $6,535,000.

It was stated in the evidence given before the Committee on Government Commissions that this money really is not cash that is held in the till for stabilization on revenue, but it is entirely locked up in equipment and buildings and stock on the shelves, so it is not available to the province for the purpose of stabilization of revenue.

Then in connection with the tax rental agreement, $123 million, and in succession duties $18,500,000. I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister could tell me what the results would have been had succession duties been included in the package for Ottawa? Would we have saved the $18 million or not?

Hon. MR. FROST: That is included in the package.

MR. NIXON: But you still collect it?

HON.MR. FROST: It is included in the package and I think the net rental works out to be about $22 million as against that we credit our collection with eighteen and one-half million dollars.

(Take D follows)

MR. NIXON: There is $4 million in this $123 million.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. NIXON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pass on. I notice we are forecasting for the next year, some $334 million in revenue, or $7 million less than we actually received this year, notwithstanding the fact the revenue from the tax rental will be $8 million more. I fancy the hon. Treasurer is deliberately pessimistic again, and we will find the revenues will actually greatly exceed the forecast.

Coming now to the question of debts. This is a question which I think is the highlight of the Budget, Mr. Speaker, because it displays an alarming condition -- and I am serious in that. We find that in every category, the debt has increased until it has reached very great proportions. The gross debt is $817 million, just a few dollars short of $1 billion. That represents an increase this year of $90,800,000. In 1943, if I may go back, Mr.Speaker, it was only $704 million, and in that year, we decreased the gross debt by $10 million, so under the regime of the hon. Prime Minister, the gross debt has increased by nearly $100 million.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member remember that part of these were loans to Hydro?

MR. NIXON: I understand there is an explanation for this, but these are the facts.

Then we come to the net debt, and probably we will receive an explanation for that, too, and this certainly does not include any loans to Hydro. This was increased this year by $78½ million. In 1943, it was $495 million, and those were the days when the hon. Prime Minister, then in Opposition, stressed on every occasion, the danger of the net debt; that it had no compensating credit which would offset it; this was a debt which had to be paid by the taxpayers.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that I put it in this way so it would be realistic. As the hon. member will notice, there is the Highway Reserve account, in which there is $30 million-odd, and also some amounts which were carried over from the Ottawa agreements. I put that in to be realistic.

What is the use of speaking about unneeded surpluses when the debt is increasing? I put it that way to bring the hon. members opposite to earth. We have no true surpluses when we have increases in

the net debt.

MR. NIXON: You are stealing my speech. If the auditor says you only have $76,000 surplus, all right. I am bringing this to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is alarming, and I do not think you have any surpluses at all. I think you have spent all the money, and you had better get your House in order a bit.

HON. MR. FROST: If the hon; member would change the emphasis on the position taken, it might assist, because he has been completely wrong in saying we have huge surpluses. There just are no such things.

MR. NIXON: I am not suggesting your surpluses are different from those stated by the auditor, but I think you have some very convenient pots sitting around into which you can dump the Highway Reserve funds, and other moneys. Of course, if that money is not actually spent this year, it will be during the next year, and the picture will remain practically the same.

In the funded debt, $725 million, an increase of $55 million. Back in 1943, it was $610 million, and was decreased that year by $9 million, so under the regime of the hon. Prime Minister, the funded debt has increased by $115 million.

Then, in regard to the guaranteed debt, or contingent liability, $730, million, increased this year by $152 million. Back in 1943 -- from the beginning of time to the year 1943 -- the total guaranteed debt of this province was $132 million, and this year it is increased -- in one year -- by $152 million; during the hon. Premier's regime, the contingent debt has been increased by $607 million.

In every category of debt, Mr. Speaker, we have had staggering increases, and it is absurd to say you have a policy of "pay-as-you-go" when the debt is increasing in this way. We are really spending the money for future generations to pay. I notice in the "Morning Smile" in the Globe & Mail, it says:

> "It is really too bad that future generations cannot be here at this time to see the great things we are doing with their money".

Probably they would appreciate spending some of this money themselves, instead of just having the privilege of paying it back.

The hon. Prime Minister, for a number of years, really held this debt condition under control, but I submit, in the last two or three years, he evidently has simply pulled the plug out of the cask and let it go down the drain. Such a record con-

cerning any of us as individuals would mean we were heading straight into bankruptcy. Of course, in connection with the province, I would not use this term; I would say that "financial embarrassment is facing them", and when you total up the contingent liabilities, and the gross debt, you have a total of $1,521,000,000 -- really astronomical figures, and it was not very many years ago that the Federal Government at Ottawa was not dealing with a much larger Budget all told than that.

The hon. Prime Minister raised great mirth in the House when he read some alleged speeches of mine made ten or eleven years ago, in which I said "If Mr. Drew carried out his 22 promises, he would ruin the province". If I cannot prove I am right -- and I am thankful I cannot -- at least he cannot prove I was wrong, because neither Mr. Drew nor the hon. Prime Minister ever carried out those promises. I am sure they will not contradict that statement. Of course, there were a few which may have been carried out, but when it comes to the 50 percent of the cost of education to be assessed against real estate, just ask the hon. members for the Toronto ridings if they are getting it now. I think they are getting about 12 percent.

Then a most sweeping promise was made that Mr. Drew would reduce taxation and he said the resolutions he had introduced into the House indicated what he meant, but the only result was that right across the board, when our Budget was $100 million, he wanted 25 percent of this struck out, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer voted for it. That was the way he reduced taxes. If Mr. Drew had done that, you would have been "broke", completely bankrupt, but the truth is the taxes have increased, and skyrocketed and spiraled by hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that a province can go broke. They have gone broke in the past. I remember when Mr. Aberhart, in Alberta, completely repudiated the debts of the province and refused to pay them; the bonds of Saskatchewan were down to $64, and nobody would buy them, and even in Old Ontario, we were running about as close to the line as anybody would want to be. In fact, in 1933 -- and do not think, Mr. Speaker, I am fighting old battles over again, but I do think the events of the past are the best guides for the future , and a study of these matters may not be amiss by the hon. members of the House.

In those days, Mr. Henry found himself

very badly in need of money, and his Deputy, Mr. White, went to the manager of the Bank of Montreal and asked them to participate in a temporary loan. This is what the bank answered:

> "Referring to our conversation with your Mr. Jones this morning when he advised that the Province of Ontario may probably permit an extension of the date by which the 1934 Automobile Licenses have to be purchased and that consequently their December and January requirements may be increased to approximately $22,000,000, of which $6,000,000 has been arranged, we telegraphed our General Managers in part as follows:
>
> > 'Canadian Bank of Commerce have intimated willingness to participate in a $16,000,000 issue of 3 months' Treasury Bills suggesting apportionment Bank of Montreal, Royal Bank of Canada, Canadian Bank of Commerce, $3,000,000 each, Bank of Nova Scotia $2,500,000, Imperial Bank, Dominion Bank, Bank of Toronto, $1,500,000 each but before opening negotiations with other banks, the Province would like the benefit of your opinion.'
>
> and have now received the following reply:-
>
> > 'Referring to your telegram of today on understanding other banks agree to advance their shares as indicated we will advance $3,000,000 against 3 months' Treasury Bills at 4¾% interest with the following stipulations:-
> >
> > (1) That the province will not reduce existing scale of taxation.

(2) That the province will discontinue making mortgage loans.

(3) That the province will budget for a balance of current income and current expenditure in the current fiscal year."

There you had the Government in such a position that they wanted to borrow $3 million from the Bank of Montreal for three months at 4¾ percent, the Bank said, "We will not loan it to you, unless you comply with our stipulations". If anybody can get any nearer to bankruptcy than that --

HON. MR. FROST: I may point out, Mr. Speaker, that of the $153 million we plan to spend this coming year, $111 million is in cash. Let me point out that for all our capital works in the province, we have been paying as high as 75 percent in cash. That is very much different from the arrangement of which the hon. member speaks, in regard to 1934. Remember that in 1934, all of their capital was charged to capital plus budgetary deficits, but today we are paying from 66 percent to 75 percent of the capital charge in cash.

MR. NIXON: But your debt is still growing faster than it did in those days.

HON. MR. FROST: That will be true, because our population is growing, and the $500 million the hon. members opposite left over for us, has

diminished, for the reason that we are paying that off with a 46-cent dollar, due to the action of our friends in Ottawa. At the present time we have nearly 5 million people --

MR. NIXON: If the hon. Prime Minister would let me make my speech, I would appreciate it.

HON. MR. FROST: I did not want the hon. member to feel too badly about our fiscal position, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NIXON: Anyway, Mr. Henry tried again to get the Bank of Montreal to loan this $3 million at 4¾ percent, and they said at that time, -- the Bank replied, December 13th, 1933, as follows:

> "Referring to your letter of December 12th regarding our participation to the extent of $3,000,000 in the proposed $16,000,000 Issue of Treasury Bills, we regret our General Managers cannot see their way to waive the conditions laid down in our letter of the 7th instant to the Deputy Provincial Treasurer:-
>
> (1) That the province will not reduce existing scale of taxation.
>
> (2) That the province will discontinue making Mortgage Loans.
>
> (3) That the Province will budget for a balance of Current Income and Current Expenditure in the Current Fiscal Year.

In the above connection our General Managers telegraphed today:-

'Province of Ontario. Referring to your letter of yesterday including $8,000,000 owed to The Bank of Nova Scotia by T. and N.O.Railway, province's Floating Debt is now $52,000,000 which it is desired to increase by January 15th to $68,000,000. Although disappearance of discount on United States Dollar if permanent should be helpful there is as yet no life to the Bond Market. Under these circumstances it is imprudent in our judgment for the Province of Ontario to continue making Mortgage Loans and we regret we cannot see our way to advance the additional $3,000,000 unless our three stipulations are accepted. There would be no need for the Authorities to advertise the fact that they are not making further Farmers' Loans at present.'"

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Prime Minister, that when he is pointing back to a period ten years ago, he go a few years further back, and he will see when he began to get hard up for money, the first thing he reduced was the grants for education purposes and the first instance we hear as to where there is to be austerity, is that he does not propose to pay any grants for gymnasiums and other types of educational institutions.

There are many other instances I could give of a similar nature, one, where I had the

experience of coming into office when the debt condition of the province was so bad that it was practically impossible to borrow money, and I well remember that for the first loan we issued, we did not get a single bid, and we found bills and debts everywhere which had to be met, and the bond houses thought they had the Government of this Province in their grasp, and refused to make a bid.

HON. MR. FROST: That was because of your repudiation legislation.

MR. NIXON: No, this was in 1934. We never had any trouble borrowing money. That is what has made the credit of the province so good. When this loan was advertised, there was not a single bid, and the then Treasurer and Premier, Mr. Hepburn, said, "All right, we will sell it ourselves over the counter here at the Parliament Buildings, and over the counters at the several Savings Offices throughout the province, and if we have not enough Savings Offices to sell them all, we will open more."

So we started to handle this $37 million loan in that way, and it was going like hot cakes, and when the bond houses found it was going to be sold in spite of them, they held a face-saving meeting downtown, and said, "We should go to the assistance of the Province of Ontario", and they

almost begged for the privilege of handling that loan. Whereas Mr. Henry could not get even $3 million at 4¾ percent, a few months after that, we sold $37 million at a cost to the province of 3.02 percent, and from that day to this, the province has not had any difficulty in its financing, and the hon. Prime Minister can thank the good work of the Government of that day for the easy time he has had in this connection.

I have the Public Accounts of 1943 before me, and the hon. Prime Minister will remember taking me very severely to task a couple of years ago for a statement I had made that the expenditures by the Government of 1943 were $100 million, and I compared that to the statement his Government presented a year ago, and he said I was "pulling the wool over the people's eyes; that I was mixing up the sheep with the goats, and I did not know the difference between them; that I was comparing the available capital expenditures with the ordinary expenditures of the Government of which I was a member".

I notice that Rt. Honourable Mr. St. Laurent, in speaking on the Speech from the Throne at Ottawa, when Mr. Drew had accused him of extravagances, pointed out that when Mr. Drew came to power

the expenditures were $100 million, and under Mr. Drew's Government, they had increased to $350,million or thereabouts.

HON. MR. FROST: Rt. Honourable Mr. St. Laurent probably read your figures.

MR. OLIVER: He could not have gone to a better source.

MR. NIXON: The expenditures in 1943 were $92 million in ordinary, and on the next page, the capital is shown as $8 million. Of course, these figures are so small, they are just chicken feed, when speaking about them, but, nevertheless, the expenditures totalled up to $8 million. Just why "deferred assets" should be called "capital expenditures", I am not enough of an accountant to know. But the $92 million and the $8 million makes substantially $100 million, and this was the figure I used as the total expenditures of that day, and I have never forgiven the hon. Prime Minister for the way he manhandled me over that very innocent and very accurate statement.

HON. MR. FROST: I take back everything I said.

MR. NIXON: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. Speaker, I have delayed the House much longer than I intended to, If I had been

allowed to type my speech out and read it, I would have been through long ago. But I do want to say a word about Hydro. We cannot make a Budget speech without mentioning Hydro, but I do so in fear and trembling, when this great Corporation has become so mighty. I have had a very practical lesson regarding what they can do to a fellow just this past winter. When the Hydro came onto my farm and built one of those horrible power lines right across my property, and put up more towers on my farm, they put more on my farm than on any other farm from the beginning of the line to where it ends, near Kitchener. That probably is the way "Bob" Saunders is getting even with me for what I have said in the past.

The hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) said the Hydro does not know the value of money, but he should do business with one of those rights-of-way men, when they come along in connection with the power lines. I am not complaining for myself so much, but I will say, Mr. Speaker, the compensation they give is certainly insufficient, and I know that such lines built across my riding have left many farmers in its wake who were very much dissatisfied, very much disgruntled, and very angry at Hydro for the way in which they had been used.

Since 1839 my grandfather, my father, myself, and my sons, for four generations, have been cutting down the trees, digging out stumps, cutting the brush and clearing the land, so we could farm it with some degree of sufficiency and satisfaction, and now the Hydro comes along and erects these horrible towers on the land. Of course, they pay you $75. for a tower, and that is all there is to it. A hundred years from now, my grandchildren -- I hope -- will have to be working around those towers, the same as I. Supposing I do get $700. or $800. in a lump sum, and I invest that money in a Hydro bond, and give it to my son. That will give him about $3.00 a year. These things are horrible nuisances; I will admit they are necessary, but Hydro should take into consideration what they are doing to the farmers and should make some effort to pay adequate compensation.

The hon. Prime Minister has frequently said that our Hydro is not costing us any more than it did ten years ago, but the other day he admitted there had been an increase of 16½ percent, and after he made that statement, I picked out of my own files my Hydro bills for December 31st, 1943, and December, 1952, equalizing everything, and I found I paid in 1943, $44.33, and in 1952, I paid $56.22, an

increase of $12.90, or some 27 percent. That does not include new rates which will come on as from the 1st of January, and if there is another increase of 15 percent, it will mean a total increase of 42 percent over 1943.

HON. MR. FROST: From 1940, the rates fell considerably and then they came up again. The other day I was referring to the Canadian National Railway, and mentioned that their costs had increased by ,roughly, 98 percent since 1940. In connection with Hydro, as a matter of fact, they were reduced in 1942 and 1943, which continued until, I think, 1946, and now the increase is only 16¼ percent over 1940.

MR. NIXON: All I know is from my own experience, and considering the money out of my own pocket, and certainly I can speak with some authority as regard to that. But these new rates increased at this time will work a hardship on the farmers, and we all know that the rural people of this province have experienced tougher times than they have during the past few years. The Federal Bureau of Statistics says that the net income of the farmers is 14 percent lower. I think the hon. Prime Minister's Department had advised him it was something a little less than that in the province of Ontario,

but when you have incomes dropping by 12 percent, and your Hydro rates going up by 15 percent or 16 percent, you can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the increases are not well received. But, the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out there is every evidence that the end is not yet in sight, and that within a year or two, we must look forward to vastly increased costs for Hydro.

Then, another matter with which I wanted to deal very briefly, is in connection with the conversion from the 25 to the 60 cycle. There was some discussion of this in a recent convention of municipalities, and it was stated that the cost of the changes in these systems, which must be borne by the municipalities, was not included in the Hydro figure. In London and Sarnia -- two of the larger cities converted, the cost of changing public utility equipment was $600,000 and $250,000. Again it was stated that Mr. Saunders had revealed the cost of rural frequency standardization amounting to $517,000, has already been recovered out of the rural rates.

(TAKE E FOLLOWS)

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this matter was discussed in the House at the time of the Legislation we were told that the total cost of conversion would be $191 million. Mr. Fred Gains,at the time, warned us that it was not an accurate or reasonable estimation, that it would certainly cost $300 million, and from appearances today it is very doubtful whether we will get it in 1961 when it is supposed to be finished, for anything like even $300 million.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: I would like the hon. member to repeat that name.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Fred Gains.

HON: MR. CHALLIES: He was not in the picture then.

MR. NIXON: You will find he made some very strong comments on this conversion business. He was absolutely opposed to it. I speak subject to correction on it, but that is certainly my recollection.

Mr.Drew very definitely promised this Province that this conversion business was not going to cost the taxpayer anything; it would not cost the 60-cycle areas anything, and it was not going to cost the 25-cycle areas anything. I always wonder how these things come in the form of manna from heaven and nobody has to pay for them. This is what he said speaking in the City of Brantford on Wednesday, June 2, 1948:

"Drew says 60-Cycle Change-over
Not to Cost Domestic User a Cent.

"'No municipality in Ontario, whether now on 60-cycle or 25-cycle, will pay one cent more because of Hydro frequency change-over,' Ontario Premier George A.Drew told a Brantford audience Tuesday evening as he spoke in the B.C.I. auditorium in the interests of C.C.Slemin, Progressive Conservative candidate here.

'No domestic user of electricity will pay one cent,' said Mr. Drew. 'No commercial user will pay one cent. No farmer will pay one cent for his change of equipment.'

The Premier said there were tremendous problems in generation and transmission because some parts of Ontario were served by 60-cycle power and some by 25.

It had been necessary to decide by May of this year whether plants in Ontario's present power development were to be wound on 60 or 25-cycle. Early last year expert advisers had been called in, and their report had been adopted by unanimous vote of the Legislature.

Mr. Drew said when Brantford's Liberal candidate, George T. Gordon, had said the change-over cost to the city of Brantford would be $3 million and there would be a $45 change-over cost to each householder, 'this is without an atom of truth.'

The program of Hydro development planned in Ontario, he said, would create more than twice the amount of power in use today, but it could be accomplished only with 60-cycle in universal use. Moreover, instead of cost of power being increased, the cost would be less."

That was his definite statement in Brantford and here today we have the facts of London and Sarnia having to pay large sums of money, and that over $517,000 has already been collected

from the farmers, the rural users of Hydro. So it does appear that the future picture in connection with Hydro is not as bright as Mr. Drew at that time led us to believe, and it is because the people of this Province of Ontario and the people of Canada, have finally caught up with Mr. Drew and his promises that his chances for success in the forthcoming election are very, very slim indeed, and I look to the time when the good old Tory Party at Ottawa, facing another defeat as they have so often in the past, will say, "We cannot carry this man any longer" and they will come to Ontario for our good friend here, and there will be a repetition of when Mr. Manion and then Mr. Meighen and Mr. John Bracken, and then Mr. Drew went to Ottawa.

I think he has about come to the end of his tether, too, because of the fact the people have at last caught up to him and his promises when he flashed across the skies in 1943 as a new man with all his very handsome and very attractive promises that he made, he certainly swept the people with him, but it was unfortunate indeed that he did not stay with us for just a little longer and we would have been over on that side of the House today.

I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, this is scarcely a "Vote as you Go" Budget with these tremendous increases in our debt position, every category of debt having increased. It seems to me that there are three ways in which surpluses can be used. They can be used in the relief of taxation. They can be used to pay off some debts, or the Government can spend it all as this Government has done. Or there might be an alternative way that you could proportion a reasonable amount of the surplus income to all three of these very necessary assets of the Budget, but I submit the Government has not done that. The tax reductions in the Budget are very, very minor. I do not think the hon. Provincial Treasurer expects any members to enthuse particularly over the race track tax deduction. It will make very little difference in any case. As far as the corporation taxes are concerned, that is incidental to the agreement with Ottawa, and evidently we are getting plenty of money from that source. As far as the mortgage tax, this was very, very small and only applies to three municipalities, I think, and in any case did not go to the Provincial Treasury, so we are being generous with someone else's money in this regard.

I suggest to the Government that they might consider starting off on tax reduction by abolishing

the amusement tax entirely. I do not believe you would ever miss the $6 million that you have collected from this source, and after all, the people who go to the theatres are having enough hard times now and will have it worse when television becomes more widespread and taxes are collected on the baseball games around the country. There was an answer given regarding the amount of money repaid to Brantford, Stratford and Guelph that did not seem proportionate and fair because some got so much more than others. The Province had imposed the Provincial amusement tax for many years and I think it would be very much appreciated if that were dropped now.

Last year I concluded my remarks on the Budget by moving an amendment that the Government of Ontario had not taken definite action to initiate discussions on the tax agreements under the new offer of the Government of Canada, and the hon. members opposite all voted against that very timely amendment.

HON. MR. FROST: I tried to tell the hon. member that the negotiations were already on, but he did not believe me.

MR. NIXON: You were talking with Ottawa about things every day, but inany case the members were all called back in the course of a few months and willingly passed the agreement with

Ottawa. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is always complaining that we never support his Budget no matter how good they make them. That is one Budget we did support and he will, of course, remember that.

I hope the House will give very careful attention to the amendment I intend to move because it is put forward with very careful consideration, and with sincere belief it is for the good of "Old Man Ontario" and this great Province:

> "I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the motion now before the House that 'Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply' - be amended by adding thereto the following: But this House regrets to note the great increase in the net debt of the Province and that no adequate provision for reduction in taxation has been made."

Mr. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): I move the adjournment of the debate.

(Take F follows)

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee, Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 80, "An Act to provide for the Federation of the Municipalities in the Toronto Metropolitan Area for certain financial and other purposes."

On Section 24:

Subsection (1) agreed to.

Subsection (2) agreed to.

Section 24 agreed to.

On Section 25, subsection (1):

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on subsection (1) of Section 25, is it the intention of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs to see that the Commissioner be one who is now holding a similar position in the municipality?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: No, I do not intend to interfere with Council when it is set up. I trust them, as I do other municipalities, and shall allow them to use their own good judgment, as I know they will.

Subsections (1) to (3) inclusive agreed to.

Section 25 agreed to.

Section 26 agreed to.

Section 27 agreed to.

On Section 28:

MR.OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, on one of these Sections -- I do not know which one it is -- I would like to make a general observation to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). There are, as I understand it, some two thousand veterans who hold small holdings which will now be within the Metropolitan Area. Heretofore they have been taxed, as I understand it, on an acreage basis. If there is going to be -- and I presume there will be -- a uniform assessment over this whole area, they would now be taxed on a frontage basis, and I would suggest to the hon. Minister, if he has not taken note of it, that there should be some provision in this Act to guarantee that these veterans' rights will be preserved.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Absolutely, in just the same way we did with the annexation in Ottawa. The veterans who had taken up, say, two acres of land and built a home, were assessed by the acreage tax Act, and their assessment was not interfered with in any way.

MR. SALSBERG: Is there any legal provision

to safeguard them?

HON.MR. DUNBAR: In just the same way as a farm.

MR. SALSBERG: This is important, and I am glad the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) raised it. Is there a specific provision to safeguard these veterans who have small holdings from being taxed on a frontage basis? The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs may feel that way, and I am glad he does, but the question does still exist where we have to provide legislation to safeguard them, and we have time to do it.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say to the hon. member for St. Andrew that the municipal position is not changed. The municipality treats veterans in the same way as the City of Toronto,and New Toronto treats small owners in a certain way, and this will not interfere with the right of the municipality to do that. We do not go to a municipality and tell them that they must do this or that or something of the sort; their rights are not interfered with in connection with these matters.

MR. SALSBERG: They may have been in the county until now, and they are coming into a municipality.

MR. OLIVER: If what the hon. Prime Minister

says is correct, how is the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs able to say that their position would not be interfered with?

HON. MR. FROST: He is quite right; their position is not interfered with. This Bill does not impose something different on them at all; they are in exactly the same position as they have formerly been. They are under their own Municipal Council, and their treatment in connection with these matters is exactly the same as it has been.

MR. SALSBERG: But what of those who have been under a county or township council supervision before, but now they come into a different type of government? The assessment rules are laid down for the entire area, and they are usually on a frontage basis.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: The assessment is not changed. It is just that the Assessment Commissioner will be over a number of Assistant Assessors who will be appointed, but it is not changing the assessment in any way.

MR. SALSBERG: Let me be more specific.

HON. MR. FROST: Supposing, for instance, as there is under way now a reassessment of the Etobicoke Township, a war veteran's home is

assessed on an acreage basis, and will continue to be assessed on an acreage basis.

It is true the value would be changed, but, on the other hand, everything else is changed -- the Bank of Toronto is changing, the industries are changing -- and in the end result a man is in the same tax position. Perhaps his tax position may be improved over what it is at the present time, for this reason: in some of these places where there are industries the homes are assessed on a higher basis, and it may be that some of the farms/are on a higher percentage than industry. This has an equalizing effect across the board.

I notice in one of the townships -- I think it is North York -- the mill rate is 117 mills on the dollar at the present time, as announced yesterday; this is practically the same as it waslast year. With a reassessment probably a veteran's holding may be assessed on an acreage basis, three times as much, but the mill rate instead of being 117 mills would be perhaps 35 mills.

That is the position now, and the relative positions will not be changed in any way, because you have a complete equalization by

reason of new assessment.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, if one were to own a property in Toronto consisting of two acres of land he would pay, not on an acreage basis, but so much per foot. If a veteran has two acres of land in an area,which was up until now considered agricultural, and he now comes under the overall municipal taxation system, the question is, whether in such a circumstance his tax rate will not rise to a prohibitive level.

HON. MR. FROST: Is there any guarantee that that will not happen in any event, even under local assessment?

HON.MR. DUNBAR: It still continues as agricultural land; it will be assessed as agricultural land. Just because it comes under this Act does not change it, unless it is sub-divided, and those men who are taxed on an acreage basis will continue to be assessed on an acreage basis. Why would they change?

MR. SALSBERG: The whole purpose may be defeated. The purpose of getting these men settled outside a municipal area may be defeated unless there is specific provision in the law.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): If there is no

provision for them it is going to put these people out of existence.

HON. MR. FROST: You could not make such a provision. Supposing Oshawa were to annex some land for certain purposes -- two or three thousand acres -- and a big industrial development starts there and housing and other things come alone, and supposing this Legislature imposed the condition that when the two thousand acres was annexed it would remain as agricultural land and would be assessed as agricultural land for fifteen years? Mr. Chairman, it would be utterly impossible; you could not impose any such thing. These things have to depend upon the circumstances. You cannot guarantee that an assessment is going to remain the same always.

I might ask the hon. member for St.Andrew how long he would consider such a condition should run. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is quite correct in saying that if these lands are in an agricultural area and they are agricultural lands, assessed on an acreage basis, there is nothing in this Act to change it. The only thing which can change this is if the area expands and it ceases to be an agricultural area. If it becomes an industrial area, or any other type

of area, of course it would be changed. Supposing these veterans' one or two acre plots are there, and supposing this Legislature were to impose a condition that the assessments were not to be changed -- how in the world can you do that when the whole area is being equalized? Furthermore, if you imposed such a condition, for how many years could it be imposed -- ten or fifteen years? In a case where the character of the land changes, and these veterans' plots are sold off, and industrial sections were built there, those same conditions would still exist. I would say you have to leave that to the good sense of the assessors; it has to be on the basis of what the conditions are across this area, and if the conditions do not change there is nothing in this Act to alter their general position as regards assessment.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I believe in some places where annexation has taken place, this is put in; the provision is there that these lands will be exempt as long as they are used for this purpose.

HON.MR. DUNBAR: This is not annexation; this is unification of services.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, that makes it

even more dangerous. Let us assume there are a fairly large number of veterans who own two-acre lots in an outlying area, and a development project like this York Township proposition of Mr. E. P. Taylor springs up, and they are engulfed by this great real estate scheme. That will change the area, and therefore their taxation will rise to almost a prohibitive level.

I understand the hon. Leader of the Opposition implied -- if he did not say so -- that we should provide some protection for those veterans. That does not mean forever, but there could be written into this Bill a Section which would say that veterans who have settled on the basis of the Federal Government's Veterans' Land Act shall be exempt from any change in taxation for a certain period of years, or for so long as they live in the house and occupy the land. If they sell or subdivide, of course, it automatically ceases.

HON. MR. FROST: Does that apply under present conditions?

MR. WARDROPE: Mr. Chairman, I am a veteran and I have a holding under the Veterans' Land Act in a municipality on the outskirts of Port Arthur. There is nothing static about my taxation; if the

municipality's taxes go up, mine do, and if they go down, mine go down. There is nothing which exempts me from taxation or guarantees to me that my taxes will be static. I do not think you can possibly put anything in this Act which would protect a veteran in that way.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): We are not referring to taxes, we are referring to local improvements.

HON. MR. FROST: The fact is, you could not write anything in which gives a preference one way or the other, except this, that as long as it is agricultural land and is an agricultural holding, it is so treated. That is the method the assessors would work on. The only thing which could cause a change would be the character of the locality, and who can say that the character of a locality will not change? The places which were farms a few years ago are covered with stores and factories and houses. I know in the northeastern part of this City -- up east of Yonge Street and south of the Lansing cut-off, along O'Connor Drive -- where only a very short time ago these lands were farm lands and being tilled; today they are covered with houses and commercial establishments. You cannot alter

the growth and the change of character of localities, and, as I say, unless these things happen, there is nothing in this Act to change it. This is based upon the Act passed in this Legislature in the spring of 1951; these assessments have been going on, and there was never any direction to the Assessment Board of this locality to change them in any particular. The only thing which has been changed is that these assessments have been equalized on the basis of the values which obtain through the years, but that does not alter the value of farmlands or veterans' holdings, or anything of that sort.

In some municipalities they have lower valuations on certain types of properties. Small homes here in the City of Toronto, for instance, and in New Toronto have been carefully safeguarded. It is left with the municipalities to grant the exemptions if they wish.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Government is ignoring the circumstances under which these grants were made to veterans. It was the understanding that these veterans could get these grants if they established themselves in certain designated areas; that is, in the low

taxation areas surrounding built-up towns or cities. Having proved to the Department of Veterans Affairs that they were locating in low-rental and low-taxation areas, they were given grants. If we should permit the character of their holdings to change, then we are not protecting those veterans.

HON. MR. FROST: How can you prevent the area changing?

MR. GRUMMETT: I think the crux of the matter was explained by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) when he said, if we would give them some protection against the installation of waterworks and so forth, or local improvements, it would be of some assistance, as they would be the most dangerous burdens on properties of this kind -- local improvements going along in front of their holdings and boosting the taxes. If we could include something in this Act to the effect that local improvements would not be assessed against the veterans' holdings, then we would protect them until their properties were cleared.

HON. MR. FROST: Is that not a matter for the overall planning board? Supposing you said that in a veterans' section no water

works or roads or sewers will be constructed, how in the world would you be able to develop the area? It may be an area immediately north of them is developing industrially. I think you have to leave it to the Area Council, to the Municipal Councils, and the Planning Boards, to protect cases such as this. After all, we cannot go into these things; we might look at conditions which are completely irrelevant, and I think we will have to trust to the good sense of the local government to protect these people, and I think they will.

MR. FISHLEIGH: Mr. Chairman, I can give you a good example of that. The hon. Prime Minister is right in his statement that you cannot change the Bill. Out in Scarborough there are about six hundred wartime houses, and the trunk sewer goes right through the centre of these three or four-acre, and in some cases two-acre lots. They do not have to tap into the sewer, but they are all permitted to do so if they wish. The sewer going through their land makes their land worth a great deal more, and the result is that now they have asked the Dominion Government whether they could sell the surplus and just keep thirty or forty feet, and

retain the profit for themselves. If they do not want the sewer they do not have to have it, and do not have to pay for it, but it does go through the centre of their property. I believe we should leave the Bill as it is.

MR. BECKETT: We have five Veterans' Land Act developments in Scarborough, and they are all assessed in the same way. Their houses are assessed the same as a home on a small lot. As the hon. member for Woodbine has said, where we have a local improvement for sewers,and we have plenty of them, we have been able to arrange with Ottawa that they may sell half their land and there is a rebate to the Government for part of that land. There is no trouble, so far as veterans' land is concerned, in Scarborough Township, and as far as the assessment goes they have been assessed on the same basis as anyone else.

MR. OLIVER: When my friends says they have been assessed on the same basis, does he mean that? I understood they were assessed on an acreage basis.

MR. BECKETT: No, not in Scarborough Township.

Subsections (a) to (d) agreed to.

Section 28 agreed to.

Section 29 agreed to.

Section 30 agreed to.

On Section 31:

Subsection (1) agreed to.

On subsection (2):

MR. GRUMMETT: Subsection (2) says, "Each such Court of Revision shall consist of one or three members . . ." I do not think it is very good practice to have a Court of Revision consisting of one member, and I would suggest that the words "one or" be stricken from that subsection, and leave it with three members. If you are going to appoint one member as the sole Court of Revision in a municipality, it puts too much power in the hands of one man.

Then, the next subsection provides that the same man may be constituted a Court of Revision for another member municipality, which is giving too much power to one man.

I would suggest the Court of Revision be made to consist of three.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: It has worked very well in Toronto.

Subsections (2) to (4) inclusive agreed to.

On subsection (5):

MR. SALSBERG: Of course, subsection (5) is

a little redundant. A Section or two before you decide that a Court of Revision may consist of one person, but where there are three you are required to have two for a quorum before they may sit. If you are allowing a Court of one, why insist on two in a case of three? Let us be consistent.

Subsections (5) and (6) agreed to.

On subsection (7):

MR. BEECH: Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection (7) of Section 31 be amended by inserting after the word "Act" in the seventh line, the words, "or any special Act," so the subsection will read as follows:

> "A Court or Courts of Revision constitued for an area municipality under this Section shall be deemed for the purposes of this and every other Act to be a Court or Courts of Revision for the area municipality constituted in accordance with the Assessment Act, and no area municipality shall constitute or continue a Court or Courts of Revision under the Assessment Act or any special Act after the 31st day of December, 1953."

Mr. Chairman, this subsection provides that no area municipality shall constitute or continue any Court of Revision under the Assessment Act after the 31st of December, 1953. In York

Township the Courts of Revision are set up under a private Act of the Township of York, and the purport of this amendment is to provide that it is covered under another special Act.

Motion agreed to.

Subsections (7) and (8) agreed to.

MR. BRANDON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to Section 31 by adding as subsection (9) the following:

> "All rights of appeal conferred by the Assessment Act upon a person assessed in an area municipality may be exercised by such area municipality, or by a person designated by resolution of the council of such area municipality, with respect to an assessment in any other area municipality and with respect to the decision of a court of revision, county judge or the Municipal Board on any appeal with respect to such assessment and, notwithstanding anything in The Assessment Act, notice of appeal to the court of revision may be given by such area municipality or by such designated person within twenty-one days after the day upon which the assessment roll with respect to such assessment is returned."

In respect to that amendment I would say that at the present time any ratepayer in any municipality has the right to appeal the assessment of any other property, and in this Metropolitan Bill we are combining the assessment of thirteen municipalities. All assessments will

be made by the Metropolitan Council under its Assessment Board. It seems to me that any local municipality or any local area municipality should have the right to appeal the assessment in any other area municipality within the Metropolitan group. To that end, the recommendation by way of addition suggests that the local council of such Area municipality should have the right, through a designated individual, to appeal the assessment.

Under the Assessment Act at the present time, any person has the right to appeal his or her assessment within a matter of ten or fourteen days, depending upon the individual by-law. The proposal here is that the time should be extended to twenty-one days, in view of the fact that the municipality would be the operating body, if it is desired.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be facetious, but may I ask if this amendment is just the amendment of a private member, or has it the approval of a caucus of the Government? I want to know the responsibility of the Government.

HON. MR. FROST: This will be satisfactory. If there are any amendments advanced which are not

satisfactory, I shall certainly say so. This amendment is satisfactory, and comes from the hon. member for West York (Mr. Brandon) himself. The point which he has raised is very well taken; in the consideration of this Bill, if there are amendments which any hon. members in this House -- regardless of where they sit, on the side of the Government or the other side of the House -- feel would strengthen or improve this Bill, I may say that suggestion will be welcomed.

Yesterday the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) suggested something in connection with one of these Sections, and I think the point was considered by all hon. members in the House to be well taken. We shall go back and consider that Section later.

(G-1 follows)

HON. MR. FROST: I can assure the House that this Bill has been most extensively discussed and considered. I do not remember a Bill, in my time in the House, which has been more objectively considered by the hon. members of this House, than the Bill we have before us at the present time.

You have heard two suggestions this afternoon, one by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Beech) and one by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon). Both of these suggestions have come from the hon. members themselves. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Beech) is a former Reeve of that Township. For many years, he sat on the County Council, and in going over that particular section, he pointed out in his old municipality, the Township of York, they had a special Act, and of course, it is relevant and necessary that the amendment should be brought in. I notice one of the papers mentioned yesterday that these proposals were made by various private members. I can assure the House these amendments have been arranged by no master mind; they are made by the hon. members themselves. The hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon) raised this point himself, and it is a point which is very well taken in connection with the equalization of

assessment across this area. If it is found in one municipality that the assessment board is making an assessment on a basis which is not the same as in another area, then any or all of the twelve municipalities outside, have the right to appeal, rather than leave it to private individuals. That point was considered, raised, and advanced solely by the hon. member for York West. I think this is a very acceptable way to do this. In connection with this Bill, we invite suggestions from all hon. members of the House, which in their opinion, will strengthen or better the Bill. We assure the hon. members these suggestions will be given the utmost consideration. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) may be successful, if he finds an amendment worthy of consideration. I can assure him it will receive our serious consideration.

Subsection 9 as amended agreed to.

Section 32 agreed to.

Section 33 agreed to.

On Section 34.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Section 34; I hope this excellent proposal or amendment will be sufficient to avoid the same fate suffered by my suggestions, motions, and amendments before,

which have been left in abeyance for a couple of years, and then suddenly the Government wakes up.

Anticipating the invitation by the hon. Prime Minister to bring in a proposal or amendment, I wish to present the following:

> "I move the following section be added to the Bill:
>
> 'Section 34(a): The partial exemption on dwelling houses from tax rates except for school purposes which now apply in the city of Toronto, shall apply in each area municipality of the municipal metropolitan area.'"

The purpose of this amendment is quite obvious, and I suggest it is a very worthy and important amendment. First, it will guarantee to the poorer sections of home owners that partial exemption they are now enjoying in Greater Toronto, will be continued.

Secondly, that the partial exemptions will be extended to all home owners in that category, in the entire area.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, partial exemption legislation was enacted in this province by, I believe, the Drury Government in 1919, and Toronto, New Toronto, and Windsor, have taken advantage of it. As I have said, it protects the

poorer sections of the home owners; it applies to the homes in which they live which are assessed below a certain figure. I think the figure now in force in Toronto is inadequate, but that is neither here nor there.

What I want to do with this amendment is to make sure that these exemptions will not be thrown away, and the people will not be robbed of these exemption benefits.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, after we adopted the amendment moved by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon), I am feeling more than I did up till now about the necessity of carrying these amendments. Having carried the previous amendment, providing a new subsection 9, I can visualize a situation, Mr. Chairman, where a government of one of the constituent municipalities may decide to appeal an assessment in Toronto on these partially tax exempt homes.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that a local government of one or another of the 13 municipalities may decide to appeal this system of taxation in Toronto. The amendment as just carried, makes possible interference by one municipal government into the assessment matters of an area outside its jurisdiction. I, therefore,

suggest this amendment I now propose, fully comes in the category of which the hon. Prime Minister spoke a few minutes ago, as being useful and necessary, and I trust that the hon. Prime Minister will agree to this amendment, even though it comes from this side of the House. There was no previous discussion regarding it as there was with the other amendments introduced so far by the hon. members for Toronto ridings, but certainly the reason is obvious, and I think the Government should not refuse to support the amendment now before the Chair.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: For the past three years, the city of Toronto has been getting my permission -- in fact, I just granted it again three days ago -- in order that they may continue exemptions in the city of Toronto. Any municipality, by a vote of the people, may make that application. The hon. member was speaking a few days ago and said we were taking away the right of the people to vote. This Bill says the people may vote for this, and yet the hon. member wants to bring forward an amendment which will force this onto the people without a vote.

There was one thing I do want to make clear. The exemptions will not apply to the

county rate, and that might as well be understood now. The county rate has to be on the total assessment roll of the rolls of the different municipalities. In regard to the local municipality; Toronto may continue, or any municipality may continue, with the consent of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to carry out their exemptions, but that does not apply to the county.

MR. SALSBERG: Let us be clear on this. It seems to me this is a new catch, about which we never heard before. Does this mean the new Metropolitan Council will undertake that that portion of the taxes will not be affected by the partial exemption system we have had in Toronto?

MR. E. L. WEAVER (St. David): Mr. Chairman, may I say a word while the hon. Minister is looking at his records. The hon. Minister has pointed out, in the first place, that the legislation which permits partial exemption from taxation is permissive legislation only, and in each municipality it must be decided, either by the municipal council, through application to the Minister, or by a plebiscite or vote, whether partial exemption from taxation will be given.

The second point I wish to make is that this permission to partial exemption from taxation

has nothing whatever to do with assessment. These properties are assessed, and if they are assessed at a certain figure, and there is a by-law in the municipality, then they get the partial exemption from taxation for local or area municipal purposes. As far as assessing throughout the entire area is concerned, the full assessment of that property is taken in regard to the total assessment of, say, the city of Toronto, vis a vis the assessment of East York, North York, and so on, and if the Metropolitan rate is struck and is levied by the Metropolitan Council upon the Metropolitan area on the basis of their total assessment, then what the area municipality does is to raise the municipal tax, and the municipalities strike a rate having regard to exemptions on certain proprties which will amend the tax they pay in the Metropolitan area.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: If the municipality desired to strike a rate on the total assessment throughout the area. If the municipality votes on this and decides to give exemption, it is not up to the Metropolitan a to what they will raise, but somebody has to raise it, and it will have to be raised from the higher assessment. Would the hon. member consider that fair and just? Does that

not levy on the Metropolitan Area as part of the total assessment?

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am more disturbed --

HON. MR. PORTER: You are not disturbed; just confused.

MR. SALSBERG: I am more disturbed than I have been since this Bill was introduced, as far as the effect of this issue of partial exemption goes. I do not get from the Government side, anysign of agreement that the whole policy of partial tax exemption. On the contrary, I think the hon. Attorney-General's interjection would lead one to conclude that he is not very happy about the policy of partial exemption.

HON. MR. PORTER: No, that is entirely a matter for the municipalities to decide, not us.

MR. SALSBERG: If the Government is not happy with it, if the Government is going to appoint a Chairman, if we have granted one area the right to appeal an assessment which interferes with other local governments, then I am not so sure that within a couple of years, the whole thing will fall.

HON. MR. FROST: Let me tell the hon. member what it means. In the city of Toronto they have a system which was carried out with the

consent of the Department of Municipal Affairs, and I think this also applies to the town of New Toronto.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Those are the only two in the province.

HON. MR. FROST: But it can be extended by a vote of the people. It is up to the municipalities. That means that one of these small houses might have been assessed for $4,000, but they assess it for $2,000.

(TAKE H FOLLOWS)

I am only taking these figures roughly. What happens is the City of Toronto, and the Town of New Toronto, under this Bill are permitted to continue doing that. Of course the effect is that the area rate, which is similar to a county rate, that is, the Metropolitan rate, is apportioned to the City of Toronto on the basis of the total assessment, not taking into account any exemption on this or any other account. They are charged on the total amount.

When it comes to applying the rate to the house in question, that house still has the assessment the Toronto people want to give it, of $2,000. Of course it must be remembered it does raise the rate within the City of Toronto for all their property, which means that all of their property pays a little more in order to give a little bit less in certain cases, but that is the right of the City of Toronto, and it is not the desire or intention of this Government to interfere with that right in either of these municipalities.

Even if a change were made, it will be at the instance of the City Council of the City of Toronto and not by this Government nor by the

Area Council. The Area Council cannot make the change. The only body that can make it is the body that has imposed it in the first place, and that is the City Council of the City of Toronto. There is nothing in this Act to change it; there is nothing in this Act to offer the relationship of the City Council of the City of Toronto to those people, and this is all we can do and all we intend to do. I would like to say to the hon. member that his amendment is quite irrelevant in view of what I have said, and while I am in agreement with what he, in general, says in his proposed amendment, I say, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary and it is irrelevant and I am sorry that it is not acceptable.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not want to prolong this discussion because I do not know whether it will help in the final vote on this amendment as we are now setting up this Metropolian Area -- or they are setting up a Metropolitan Area -- and they are setting up a type of Metropolitan Government with an appointed Chairman.

HON. MR. FROST: What the hon. member has asked us to do is this: the City of Toronto and the Town of New Toronto have voluntarily -- because they have requested it -- made this exemption apply within their

area. What the hon. member is asking us to do is by a stroke of the pen to make that apply to all the municipalitieswhich would be completely unsound and unjust and undemocratic.

MR. SALSBERG: The government is putting over this whole deal without giving the people a chance to vote on it, but they now balk at doing a little thing that really is progressive. A whole project, I appeal to you, should not be imposed before the people vote. You reject that, but here is a very progressive piece of legislation and you insist you want to be democratic and not introduce it.

Amendment negatived.

Sections 34 and 35 agreed to.

On Section 36.

MR. SALSBERG: I thought we were only going to take up the second part of this today. I understood the Government's policy was to deal with only one section a day.

HON. MR. FROST: Parts III and IV run together, one deals with waterworks and the other with sewers and I think we can get partway through section 3. I thought it would be desirable and we could complete section 3 and section 4 tomorrow.

MR. SALSBERG: We have finished with section 2, but the Chairman has now taken Section 3 as I suggest that Sections 3 and 4

be left and dealt with separately. We work from day to day.

HON. MR. FROST: We will not finish Section 3 tonight, but we could deal with part of Section 3, and that would enable us to complete Sections 3 and 4 tomorrow.

MR. SALSBERG: I am speaking for myself, but basing my work on the earlier intentions of the hon. Prime Minister, I have been preparing my amendments from day to day because it is a big Bill and I have no assistants, no deputies, and I am not in a caucus; that is the way I work. I organize my time during the Session to deal with a great many items.

HON. MR. FROST: There are fifteen parts to this Act, and we have not that many days before Easter, so we have to double up somewhere, but if the hon. member looks it over and finds there is an amendment he desires tomake, we will consent to come back to that Section if he so desires.

Sections 36 to 39 inclusive agreed to.

MR. OLIVER: Are we having a night session?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. GRUMMETT: It was understood, Mr. Chairman, that there would be no night session,

and I believe some of us have made other arrangements. I think the hon. Prime Minister definitely stated there would be no night session.

HON. MR. FROST: I advised Mr. Speaker about this, and I made all arrangements this afternoon. I believe all hon. members were informed regarding the night session. I am anxious to go ahead with the Department of Education Estimates.

MR. OLIVER: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. Prime Minister should shove the Education Estimates in tonight without any warning at all. He should tell us in all fairness a day ahead, at least.

HON. MR. FROST: I had this down for yesterday, and I advised the House that the Department of Education Estimates would come up yesterday. Last evening at 10.15 or 10.20 I adjourned the House with the idea of not having hon. members sit here very late hours, and I thought we could deal with the Department of Education Estimates tonight. There are quite a few Bills which we would like to advance, in order to get them before the various Committees which are sitting.

MR. OLIVER: You have not given us any warning at all.

HON. MR. FROST: They were announced yesterday.

MR. SALSBERG: Speaking for myself, I left the House yesterday with the definite assurance of the hon. Prime Minister that there would be no night session today, and certainly there was no announcement in this House as to what Estimates would come up. I do not think it is fair to expect hon. members to come in and deal with Estimates which they have not been advised will be presented to the House. It takes time to prepare, gather yourmaterial and study the Estimates of a Department.

HON. MR. FROST: I shall do my very best to tell hon. members what will come up in the ordinary course of business. I try to do that, and I can assure the House I shall be very glad to do it.

In connection with the Department of Education Estimates, I am very glad to assist in this, and if hon. members would prefer to go through with the next two parts of Bill No. 80, if that would be of assistance I am prepared to try to work it out and we could perhaps take the Department of Education Estimates tomorrow. But, on the other hand,

we have the hon. Minister of Education here. He knows his Estimates are coming up, and I should imagine hon. members of the House would prefer a change of diet. I do not think, in the matter of the Estimates for the Department of Education, much preparation is required. Hon. members of the Opposition are always prepared in connection with the matter of education.

MR. OLIVER: Could the hon. Prime Minister tell us if we will have a night session tomorrow?

HON. MR. FROST: I did not contemplate a night session. I had considered it but I found it was unsatisfactory. I am told there is a possibility of a night session on Thursday; it will depend upon our progress.

It being six of the clock the House took recess.

- - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XXIV

Tuesday, March 17, 1953.

0

EVENING SITTING

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

Toronto, Ontario,
Tuesday, March 17, 1953.

The Committee resumed, Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we proceed with the Estimates of the Department of Education, and a little later we might come back to this Bill on the Order Paper. I think that might be the better procedure.

I move that the Committee do now rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, before submitting the Estimates to the House in detail, may I indicate some of the features of the year's operations?

In the Department of Education we have

no headaches, but we have many problems. They are problems which are not of the sort that worry one because all our problems are caused by the expansion of this Province, by the increasing population, and to deal with problems under those circumstances is really a pleasure. It is something to see how our school population increases, although it brings us problems, and how in general the cost of education moves forward at what I might call an accelerated pace.

This year we have in the schools of Ontario 848,423 pupils; that is both the secondary and the elementary schools. Of this number, 53,909 are new pupils, in addition to those we had last year. Of that almost 54,000 new material, 45,785 are in the elementary schools, so there is the first of our great problems, the expansion, the increase in population. That brings with it, of course, the related problem of obtaining teachers for those pupils, obtaining more teachers each year.

We have taken certain means to try to provide teachers for the schools. Not one school has been closed in the Province of Ontario this year for lack of a teacher. There have been some uncertificated teachers; we have had

to have them, but relatively not many, and all of them with at least some education, most of them with some training. We are not going to use the word "training" regarding teachers any more; we are going to use the word "preparation", because we are making certain changes in the system. We are not going to speak of "Normal Schools" after the 1st of July; we are going to speak of "Teachers' Colleges." The term "Normal Schools" has been in use for a hundred years or so, and it did mean, I suppose, in those early days, a school in which teachers were taught in a way which was considered normal. Now we are going to do something a little different, and we will have Teachers' Colleges.

We really have nine Teachers' Colleges in the Province of Ontario. We have two Normal Schools in Ottawa, two in Toronto, one in London, one in Stratford, one in North Bay, one in Peterborough and one in Hamilton. The one in Hamilton, of course, was burned down, but that will be taken care of. Our two Normal Schools are conducted, one in the forenoon and one in the afternoon of each day; we have staggered classes, but two distinct Normal Schools. After this we are going to drop that term and speak only of

"Teachers' Colleges".

If you look at the Estimates you will find the term "Teachers'Colleges" is used.

In the preparation of teachers we have raised the standards, and we have done it in such a way that we hope to increase the number of teachers who will be prepared for the work of the classroom. We have raised the standards in this way: for a good many years an applicant for Normal School required five papers of Grade 13, which was formerly called Upper School, and before that, Honour Matriculation. They had to have five papers; such papers as English literature, English composition, perhaps French authors, French composition, history -- any five, as long as English was one of them. We are changing that and we are requiring applicants to Teachers Colleges to have eight papers,or eight subjects, as some call them, of Grade 13. We are going to accept next September, young people who have eight papers of Grade 13,for a one-year course in the Teachers College. We have raised the standard in that respect.

We are going to get a number of these young people who wish to be teachers at an earlier

age; we are going to take them if they have completed Grade 12, which was formerly called Middle School, and was one time called Junior Matriculation. We are going to take those people at the end of Grade 12 and have them in Teachers Colleges for two years, instead of one. Some people have not been clear as to how the standard is raised in that respect. It is raised this way: we are going to have them for a year in a Teachers College, where otherwise they would be in high school or a collegiate institute; that is, they could get five papers in half a year, probably. Now we are going to require them to be in a Teachers College for a whole year, and we are going to give them training of both an academic and a professional character.

In that respect we have raised the standard, and at the same time we have good prospects of getting increased enrolment in our Teachers Colleges.

This does not tell the whole story, because to meetthe emergency of this year and next year, and for a few years to come, we must do something more, so last year we began this method. We are taking young people who have completed Grade 12, bringing

them into a summer course of five weeks and giving them an intensive preparation in that time, and then sending them into schools for a year to teach. We shall bring them back the next summer for another five weeks, and then let them teach for another year; after that they will have a year in a Teachers College. In that way we are giving them practice along with the academic and professional preparation, and that plan seems to be working out reasonably well so far.

Last year we had 506 of these young people anxious to be teachers taking this five weeks' preparation. They were then sent to different schools, and the reports I received from the Inspectors are to the effect that these young people -- nearly all of them -- are doing remarkably well. They have the idea that they want to teach and they are going to teach, and they have just enough preparation and enough practice to step into the profession and to do reasonably well. It seems to be an excellent means of overcoming the difficulty.

We expect during the coming summer over 700 of these young people anxious to teach.

(BB-1 follows)

Of course, we have always the matter of new school buildings to accommodate the increasing number. It would appear, according to the best information available, and statistics, we will have each year about 50,000 more pupils than we had the year before. That is, in 1954, we will have 50,000 more than we had in 1953, and so it goes.

This means not only additional teachers, but more buildings. You can very well imagine, Mr. Chairman, when school boards have to provide for 50,000 additional pupils, each year, it is going to mean a good deal of expenditure for school buildings, and also that as far as the Department is concerned, we must confine our grants to class rooms only, and we had so decided some time ago, and have so notified all school boards.

That does not mean we are cutting out subjects from the curriculum; not at all. We are not saying there is to be no physical education taught, no home economics, no art, music, or anything of that sort. We want them all there, but we want them in their due proportion, and not crowding out the basic subjects which everybody needs. When the trustees were first notified we must carry out this idea, because there is just enough money for that purpose, that is, we must

confine our grants to new buildings and the construction of class rooms, only, they did not understand. Representatives of various trustee bodies came in and wanted to know what it was all about, but when it was explained to them, and when the hon. Prime Minister explained it in the House, the other day, they were perfectly satisfied, and went away, saying, "It is a matter of finances; we are perfectly satisfied; we will go ahead." They understand that physical education can be taught in this moderate climate of ours outside; hockey games can be played outside, and they said they would be able to get along.

Mr. Chairman, those are some of our problems. I would not call them "difficulties" which we have to overcome, but they all spring pretty much from the one source, and we are delighted that such is the case.

Mr. Chairman, if I may now submit my Estimates in detail, I shall be happy to do so.

On Vote 37.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am rising at this time to say a few words of a general character before I come to the specific item of the Vote before us, and I do so under protest, because I think it is an insult to the House, and a

disregard of the established procedure of the House, on the part of the Government, to enforce consideration of this important Department Estimate at an evening session, about which we did not know earlier, and most hon. members of the House were asked to consider the Estimates of such an important Department, for which the House was not prepared. If I am rising now, it is not because I am prepared, but because the Estimates deal with one of the most important problems before the province, and, prepared or unprepared, I think that which is essential must be said.

I might say if the Opposition had fought harder, this could have been averted, and I think the Opposition would have been justified in refusing to sit in consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Education, when they were rushed into the House in the manner in which they were.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunlop) in his very brief introduction, has spoken about some of the problems which confront his Department, and I feel obliged to say that the problems upon which he touched constitute the worst indictment of this Government's failure to plan ahead. We can argue whether all the money requested be necessary to provide for one or other of the departments, but

when it comes to education, the Government has been in power for ten years, and has demonstrated a hopeless lack of planning in the field of education, if only from what the hon. Minister has said here tonight.

There is a critical shortage of teachers, the hon. Minister told us. He did not use the word "critical", but he said there was a problem of providing teachers, and I use the expression "critical" quite conscientiously, and I say there is a crisis because of the lack of teachers in the province, and I say that the crisis was foreseen years ago. The Hope Report foresaw this crisis, warned against it, and asked for means to be taken which would provide thousands of new teachers. It is a fact that there are many hundreds of teachers in the province now who are not qualified for the teaching profession.

We have been advised that there are 178 teachers in one-room schools who have had no professional training whatsoever, and there are 450 teachers in one-room schools who have had only partial training. We are told also the province will require at least 10,000 high school teachers within five years, 4,000 teachers more than are now employed. I think the Government owes

it to the House and to the province to tell us why they failed to plan, and to undertake measures which would have guaranteed a supply of qualified teachers to meet the needs of a growing school population. They have not done that, and I think an explanation is due.

I do not think it is sufficient to say, "Well, we simply have a problem". A Government is supposed to know, and this Government was warned, but they have done nothing.

There is a problem of school facilities, and again the Government has failed to plan sufficiently ahead to provide the schools for the growing child population which is entering the public and high schools. In areas where they are now confronted with the inescapable crisis and a challenge, such as in Greater Toronto, they are throwing it onto the shoulders of the ratepayers.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, may I tell the hon. member for St. Andrew, if this Government has been remiss in planning to overcome a shortage of teachers -- and there is no shortage of high school teachers at the moment -- then the Governments of Great Britain, Ireland, and all the States of the United States have also been remiss because the shortage of teachers is ten times as great in

New York State as it is here. If that is the case, all the governments have been remiss.

MR. SALSBERG: That may or may not be so. I am not questioning it. But that does not at all justify this Government. It is a small excuse to say that other governments have also been remiss. As a matter of fact, the New York Times -- a very conservative journal -- has been carrying an intensive campaign conducted by its education editor, for some time now -- I am sure the hon. Minister is aware of that -- against this very problem about which I am speaking, and has been taking to task the States' and Federal governments of the country to the south of us. It is no excuse to say that others are also caught unawares. The fact is, the Globe & Mail is very correct in an editorial of January 3rd of this year, when it said:

> "This prospect is not a sudden discovery. It was forecast by the Royal Commission on education in 1949, in an interim report which recommended that an emergency teacher training program be introduced so as to provide 8,000 new teachers for all grades by 1959.
>
> It would appear that the Commission's astimates were low, and that the continuing rise in the birthrate plus the addition due to immigration, have outstripped the foreboding picture presented by the Commission's statisticians only three years ago."

(TAKE CC FOLLOWS)

Then the Editorial goes on to say:

> "Very little direct action was taken by the Department of Education until the spring of 1952 when measures to increase the number of elementary school teachers were taken. In the main, these relied on the unsatisfactory method of reducing the educational qualifications and, in most cases, the age at which teachers might begin their duties. Little was done for the secondary school level, but the necessity for early action is apparent, unless there is to be a wholesale abandonment of the standard reached by publicly supported education in this province."

I think every word that I have read here is correct and it does constitute an intimation -- I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not talking about the present Minister of Education. He is a newcomer to his post. I am fully aware of it and I want him to feel that I am not directing any fire against him as a person, I am speaking about the Government's failure to meet with one of the most important tasks that has confronted them, and we are now advised of an attempt to overcome the crisis by lowering standards and producing teachers that a few years ago would have been rejected from most schools.

They may qualify in time, and I hope they will, as the result of special courses and special studies, and so on, and become fully qualified teachers for our schools, but in the meantime we are meeting the crisis that

we knew was coming upon us by an emergency measure that is bound to lower the standards.

One other thing the hon. Minister dealt with which I feel should be touched upon, and that is the Government's attitude towards the question of frills and fads. He did not use that term tonight but it is so fully identified with the hon. minister that I cannot help but use it. He spoke about auditoriums and other facilities the Government has cut out.

I feel very keenly -- as I am sure a number of the hon. members and most people outside do -- about this measure the Government has undertaken. It may be as the hon. Minister told us that when representatives of the Boards of Education appeared before him and he and the hon; Prime Minister explained to them that it was a matter of money, they were satisfied and left. I question whether they were satisfied but I say to this Government there is no other avenue that is more important for this or for any other government to travel on and spend money than providing the necessary school facilities for the children of the Province. I reject any suggestion that it is good economy to minimize on an auditorium or a gymnasium. I reject it because I am convinced that it is being penny wise and pound

foolish and that we are harming the most important section of our population, the youngsters, and I say this not as a sentimentalist, although I am often guilty of being sentimental. I say it is necessary for us to make our school structure so modern, so well equipped, so attractive that they will become centres into which young and old are glad to come, not only rooms in which the three R's are taught.

When we tell the School Boards of this Province, as this Government has done in its communique of February 17th, that grants will be made only in respect to ordinary class rooms, then I say this Government is turning its back on universally accepted principles of education and is in addition being penny wise and pound foolish.

Some people like the old idea of the one-room school, the little red school house. We all idolize it and all those who applaud are fine men and would have become finer men if they had had finer schools than they did, and that applies to me as well as all of us. Unless you have reached the zenith of progress, and there is no room for improvement, this applies to you. But to come back to the point I wanted to make, it is wrong from an educational point of view, and it is wrong from a dollar-

and-cent point of view, because if you check you will find, and I think the Department officials could substantiate this fact that where you have modern attractive well-equipped schools, the percentage of delinquency is smaller than in the areas where schools are poor and unattractive and you have not the provisions that are required. We want schools in which our youngsters will go with joy, wanting to go to school and wanting to return there in the evening to participate in various activities that the school facilities will provide. If you deny them this, you are forcing them out into the streets and on the street corners and into all sorts of activities that ultimately result in delinquency that necessitate later the building of penitentiaries and prisons which cost millions of dollars to build and millions to maintain.

I cannot go along with the government on this question. I am glad to see the hon. Prime Minister who sat in the back benches nowcoming down to the front because he has something to say.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says because the gymnasiums are to be curtailed today, you will be filling the penitentiaries tomorrow. Mr. Chairman, here is the

hon. member for Peel and there are many others here who were at school when there was hardly a gymnasium in the Province, and I do not recollect that the penitentiaries were full. If the hon. member would devote his talents to common sense, he would do much better.

MR. SALSBERG: Do the schools of Lindsay have a gymnasium or auditorium?

HON. MR. FROST:: At the present time, no. Around this country,largely as the work of this Government, there are literally hundreds of rinks and playing fields. In connection with my riding, it is not any different than any other riding. The other day I was opening a rink and in that area there are about a dozen new rinks and playing fields. Those are things that the members of this House did not have when they went to school in that community, and that is true all over the province of Ontario.

There is nothing to be gained by making wild statements of that sort. It is far better to look at facts. We have a problem in this Province, growing as it is, and we have to make every dollar count if we are going to pull it out of debt as the hon. member complained about this afternoon.

Just take a good measure of common sense

and it will all come out right.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not surprised that some members of this government applaud the hon. Prime Minister because what I said is painful to receive, but it must be given and it hurts me to give it, too. I want to assure you, as the father assured his youngster when he used the back of a brush on him, that "It hurts me more than it does you." I find no pleasure in making the indictment, but I feel it is necessary and I am not engaging in any wild statements.

HON. MR. FROST: In connection with what the hon. member has said, I would like to refer to the remarks about delinquents in this Province. I saw an item in one of my own newspapers the other day about a man up there who talked about delinquents in the banner portion of Ontario, Victoria and Peterborough. There was never more nonsense spoken in the world. Our young people today are the best young people this land ever had. It would be wrong to share in the libelling and slandering of the young people of this Province, because they are all good people.

(Take DD follows)

In my opinion, the establishment of centres of activity of a wholesome and healthy sort in our school structure everywhere would go a long way towards reducing delinquency. This is a sound point to make, and I do not think we should economize on that requirement. That is all I am saying.

I feel these points have to be made at this time; I do not think this Government should economize on that aspect of our need, and it is a need. I do not think it could be justified on

(Page DD-2 follows)

the ground that there is so much construction necessary, that we must concentrate only on classrooms because there is quite a construction program in the Province. I know of no other construction work which is more important and should have greater priority than the auditoriums and the gymnasiums and all the facilities for our schools. I place that even ahead of the housing shortage, and it is certainly ahead of theatres, breweries, liquor clubs, and things of that kind.

There is no problem of materials, no problem of construction labour, and certainly there is no problem of money, after listening to the Budget.

After having said what I felt was absolutely necessary to be said on this occasion, I close with the sincere appeal to this Government to change its policy in regard to the needs of our growing child population, so that our schools could really become what they ought to be, the most attractive, the most inviting and the most stimulating centres for our young people.

Second, that the Government take steps to meet the crisis in the teaching profession by not reducing standards, but by helping the municipalities to raise the minimum of wages

paid to teachers, so that it becomes more attractive and so that teachers will feel they are not obliged to resign their teaching positions and take jobs in industry and commerce, where they can make more money. There is no right on our part to insist that they work for less because they are teachers, and I appeal to the Government to make sufficient funds available for the municipalities' boards of educations to enable the schools to attract the best types of teachers, and keep them, once they have gone through the training, and have taken up their very important and responsible tasks.

Vote 37 agreed to.

On Vote 38:

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, I am always interested in my brother Indians, and I was noticing in Item 7, "Inspection of Indian Schools, services and travelling, $3,000." It seems rather a small item, and I was wondering if the regular county inspectors inspect these schools, and if so, why should there be any additional expense? Does the Federal Department reimburse the Province in any way?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: This Department inspects the schools of the Indian Affairs Branch of

the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, and an Order in Council of April 9, 1929, authorized payment to the inspectors of $8 per classroom, and necessary travelling expenses. The Indian Affairs Branch pays this Department the sum of $15 per classroom for these services, and we include that in the record. It is rather a co-operative effort.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, under Item 8 of Vote 38, may I ask how many railroad school cars there are, and what the average attendance at the school cars is?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: We have six school cars and the average attendance is a shade over twenty-one. There are three on each line.

Vote 38 agreed to.

On Vote 39:

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, under Vote 39, Secondary Education Branch at Provincial Institute of Mining at Hailbury, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell me how many students are enrolled in that school?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: There are thirty-eight.

MR. NIXON: Under Item 20, may we have some explanation of that? It is the Dominion-

Provincial agreement.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: In the previous year, Mr. Chairman, we provided $100,000 under that particular item, and this year we are putting in a quarter of a million dollars. That special work, under the Dominion-Provincial Agreement, falls under three headings: the training for the armed forces, of which the Dominion Government provides the entire cost -- we spend the money and recover one hundred per cent; training for defence industries -- we recover 75 per cent of that; and rehabilitation of handicapped people, and we recover 50 per cent of that.

Vote 39 agreed to.

On Vote 40:

MR. NIXON: This is a very important vote, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister of Education has already given us some enlightenment on the teachers' training branch, and I was wondering if the Normal Schools are filled to capacity now? Has there been any difficulty in getting enough applicants to fill these institutions?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: This year we have increased enrolment in all our Normal Schools, except the one at North Bay, which is down about ten. Of course, we have a big increase in the

Toronto Normal School; 657 was the latest figure for Toronto, so it really is up considerably, 245 in all.

MR. SALSBERG: Is it correct that the Government is proceeding with the construction of a new building for the Normal School?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Oh, yes.

MR. SALSBERG: Where will it be located?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: On another part of the same site as the one on which the present structure stands. You see, Mr. Chairman, the Normal School unfortunately was destroyed by fire, and we may be able to rehabilitate it a little for some purpose. We are trying to follow as far as we can the policy of keeping our Teachers Colleges as closely associated as possible with the Universities, and so in Hamilton we are negotiating at the moment for site quite near McMaster University, and I hope we shall be able to carry out that policy.

Vote 40 agreed to.

On Vote 41:

MR. HOUCK: I notice there is some curtailment in community programs. Do you expect to cut that down this year?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: In community programs, yes.

That arises in this way: we spent a good deal on what we call leadership training courses, in different localities in the Province, and these leadership training courses were quite successful. We have trained leaders now and we do not need to go on with that, and we are able to reduce the expense there.

It is particularly gratifying when a group of people in a community can provide their own leadership and we can leave them on their own resources. It works out very nicely. We have two people in different localities who can conduct drama and that sort of thing, and we do not need any more leaders. One of these men resigned, and we do not have to replace him. One man died, unfortunately, in the Ottawa Branch, and we were able to carry on without replacing him. That work is going along very nicely, with the general idea of helping the people to help themselves.

MR. NIXON: What about these correspondence courses? How many are taking these courses now?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: These correspondence courses seem to be developing all the time; 1,683 is the present number. We have correspondence courses all the way from the

beginning up to the end of Grade 13, and we supply these to young people in places remote from schools. I have known cases of where the mother had been a teacher, and she procured these correspondence courses for the children, and brought them right along as fast as though they had been able to attend school. We are greatly pleased with the development in this particular branch, and we have some trade correspondence courses which are going out all over the Dominion.

Vote 40 agreed to.

On Vote 41:

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, Item 25, rural community night classes. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if this is a new idea instituted recently?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: It is a developing feature of our work, Mr. Chairman, and a great deal of it is done in co-operation with the Department of Agriculture. It works out very nicely this way. It seems to be a good idea; from a place like Bancroft, for instance, we have reports of a very successful night school, part of it quite academic, and part of it -- not technical training exactly, but technical agriculture would perhaps be a better name for it.

(EE-1 follows)

MR. GRUMMETT: Is there any reason for reducing the grant for training in citizenship? I notice it is down by $3,000 or $4,000 this year, from last year.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, that brings up a real point. We have felt -- and I imagine hon. members of the House will agree -- that the responsibility for giving new Canadians training in basic English and in citizenship, is primarily the responsibility of the Dominion Government, which brings the new Canadians here. So far we have been assuming this task on a fifty-fifty basis, with the Boards of Education. After seeing one or two of the hon. Ministers in Ottawa, it has finally been decided the Ottawa Government will spend considerably more than it has done so far, and will, indeed, provide one-half the amount we provide. I think that will be an improvement.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I am interested in some of these American companies peddling these correspondence courses in Canada. I wonder if the hon. Minister has had any occasion during the past few months to look up the credentials of some of these companies who are advertising in Ontario.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: We try, Mr. Chairman,

to take care of that situation. I may say we share the views of the hon. member for Ontario to a great extent. We have a Trade School Branch in the Department, with a Commissioner who registers Trade Schools if he is satisfied they are really doing the work they undertake to do, and we are keeping a watchful eye on that all the time.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, Item 48, "Summer courses of teachers": are these course optional or compulsory?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, I do not care for the word "compulsion" in regard to this sort of thing. I am not saying this was not the right word to use there, but, having been a long time in charge of summer courses for one of the Universities, I have seen what a difference it makes if young people take these courses voluntarily; there was a time when they were required to take them, and required to take many courses in order to have their certificates made permanent. I did not like that at all.

It seems to me that young people who are ambitious and anxious to improve their status, may quite well be left to their own devices. They

will attend summer courses with quite a different spirit if it is a voluntary undertaking on their part. Nothing is going to be compulsory except those emergency summer courses which I mentioned at the beginning.

Vote 41 agreed to.

On Vote 42:

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 42 I want to raise the problem of supplemental examinations. I raised this question in the House for the first time when the Hon. Mr. Drew was Minister of Education, and he at that time thought the matter would receive some attention. A year ago the Toronto Board of Education applied to the Provincial Department of Education and asked that arrangements be made for supplemental examinations to be made possible for Grade 13 pupils who had failed in one or two papers on the Entrance examinations. In brief, Mr. Chairman, to make it clear to hon. members, it is a matter of permitting a student who fails in one or two papers in his Entrance examination to try again in the fall, so as not to lose one year of study and a year of his life.

I suggested in the past, and I suggest now,

there are many circumstances -- especially in working class homes, but also in other homes -- where young students may experience difficulties and cannot complete the full course.

In the United States that is a very common practice, that they try Entrance examinations every few months; I believe three or four times a year. Here it has been discontinued for many years. I believe the present hon. Minister answered this point when I last raised it, and he said that it would create difficulties in preparing examinations for the September trials.

I was glad to find that the Toronto Board of Education had come around to the point and considered it wise to institute that practice, but I learned also from the press that the Provincial Department of Education jected the request of the Toronto Board of Education.

I have inquired of a number of our Provinces to find out whether they have supplemental examinations. I shall quote from only a few of the replies from Provincial Departments of Education. I have here a letter dated as late as March 11, 1953, from the Assistant Registrar of the Department of Education, British Columbia. In reply to my inquiry, he says, and I quote his letter

in part:

> "This Department of Education holds supplemental examinations in August, which may be written by those students who failed to obtain standings in June. These supplemental examinations are held only at the university entrance level and at the senior matriculation level. The Department of Education does not hold departmental exams at any other level."

In British Columbia, Mr. Chairman, it is possible for students to try these examinations. Here I have another letter from the Deputy Minister of Education of the Province of Alberta, who says very briefly:

> "Dear Sir:
>
> "The Alberta Department of Education has for a great many years conducted supplemental examinations on Grade 13 subjects towards the end, of course, that students who failed to pass the June examinations are permitted to write these supplementals, along with certain other classes of candidates."

I have a reply from the Director of Protestant Education in the Province of Quebec, in which he makes it clear that supplemental examinations are possible in that Province.

There is another one from the Director and Chief Superintendent of Education, Fredericton, New Brunswick, to say that they have supplementals.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from Saskatchewan, written by the Director of Examinations, and they too have supplemental examinations.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the fact this is prevalent in so many of our sister Provinces, it would be wise and proper for this Province to make these facilities available for students. I believe it is harsh in many instances; it is hard on some students. Sometimes they are sick and sometimes they have to work evenings and Saturdays, and so on, and they fail in a paper or two. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, every hon. member of this House has had this experience at one time or another, that I have had on a number of occasions, where parents will come with a child and will appeal for some assistance. It may mean the loss of a year, and during the year the young person may while working get a job elsewhere, and by not being able to repeat, be lost entirely for higher education.

I know the hon. Minister says there is provision for appealing against the marks; I do not know just how he worded it, but there is room for appeal against the rating given the student

on the basis of examination papers. I know that is so, that a student may appeal, and there are cases where, as a result of the appeal, he has been allowed to enter university, but I think it should be universal.

I do not want to take much time on this question, but I think it is serious. May I say to hon. members of the Government, I have in addition to making these inquiries of our sister Provinces, conducted a sort of personal Galup poll. When I meet a group of young people, high school students, I ask them this question, and universally their answer is: "Yes, we should be given another chance in case we miss out on a paper or two," and I say for the little bit of inconvenience it may cause some servants in the Department, the good it will do will far outweigh the bit of hardship and inconvenience that the preparation of September supplemental examinations will entail.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member for St. Andrew, do they have them in the Hamilton schools the R.C.M.P. were speaking about?

MR. SALSBERG: I have been speaking of Provinces, not towns.

MR. STEWART: But I say, do they have them in the Hamilton schools the R.C.M.P. were speaking about?

MR. SALSBERG: Where?

MR. STEWART: In the schools in Hamilton the R.C.M.P. were speaking about the other day?

MR. SALSBERG: I never spoke about Hamilton.

MR. STEWART: I said the R.C.M.P. spoke of it.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the hon. member for Parkdale is speaking about, and I usually do know what people are talking about. However, I think the other hon. members of the House know what I am speaking about.

MR. STEWART: So does the hon. member.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I would appeal to the Government to reconsider their stand on this question.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Provinces mentioned by the hon. member for St. Anderew have fewer students by far than this Province has. Would it surprise the hon. member to know that in 1952, last summer, there were 14,724 students who wrote Grade 13 examinations? That is almost 15,000. The number of papers they wrote was 81,761, or almost

82,000 papers. The number of papers that were passed were 66,523. Now when you have a mammo undertaking like that, you cannot go through it twice, and still provide everything else that may be required.

If we had supplemental examinations in August, for example, it would take a longer time to get those papers marked; such a long time that it would carry us past the application date for the universities. We would have to put an army on to get the papers marked in time.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the hon. member for St. Andrew that I have dealt with Grade 13 students for a great many years, and I never yet have found a case where, if a pupil were properly guided, he or she was really in the position of losing a year. There is always a way to solve that particular problem, if one or two papers have been missed.

After papers are marked, there is a revising board which sits and deals with all papers which are under 50 per cent, deals with them in a most generous way. We lean backward to give a pupil every possible consideration, and that revising board is something which other Provinces have not, as far as we know,

nor those States in the United States which have a different way of admitting students to universities.

We always have to provide for another class of people. If we put on August examinations, there would be any number of young people in the schools who would say: "Well, now, I am not going to write all my subjects in June; I shall hold over two or three for August." A number of others would say: "Well, I am going to write in June on alegbra, geometry and trigonometry, but I am afraid I am not getting as high standing as I would like to make, and I shall just write them again in August," and we would have the whole 15,000 writing again in August for one reason or another.

It is such a stupendous undertaking, and we have such confidence in this revising board, we are quite sure absolute justice is being done every student in the country.

Votes Nos. 42 to 45 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote 46:

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, how much is it costing the Province to supply textbooks, and where would we find that item?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: It will have to be taken

out of the general grant, Mr. Chairman. Would it be in order if we send that to the hon. member for Brant?

MR. NIXON: I would be interested in knowing how much it is costing.

MR. SALSBERG: On that point, Mr. Chairman, how many textbooks does the Department provide for courses on alcoholism? I know one the Department was kind enough to send me, the most recent one, but I was wondering whether there are other textbooks issued.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: We have Mr. Speers' textbook on alcoholism, Mr. Chairman, and a number of pamphlets. I think those are all that are available.

MR. SALSBERG: There is that one textbook?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: There is one textbook, plus these pamphlets, yes.

Votes 46 and 47 agreed to.

On Vote 48:

MR. NIXON: The hon. Minister of course recalls the very unfortunate accident that happened in the Brantford School for the Blind at Christmas time. Was there any coroner's inquest on that or any report received by the Department, and was anything done about it?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: That was a most deplorable accident. We did everything we could in the way of extending our sympathy and assistance to the family. . The truck driver who caused the accident was found guilty a few days ago and was fined.

MR. GORDON: Was the person who was in charge of those sleigh rides instructed in St. John's Ambulance, or could he give first aid? I understand the one who was injured was put into a truck and taken for treatment.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, for the information of the hon. member for Brantford, the unfortunate girl's back was broken and it was a case where there was nothing that could be done by first aid at all. The Department of the Attorney General is still watching the case, I understand, on behalf of the parents who, in case hon. members do not know, live in Saskatchewan,out in the country. This girl had been with us in the School for the Blind in Brantford from her childhood, and it really was a most distressing accident. I think I can assure the hon. member that we have done everything we possibly could.

MR. GORDON: The point I wanted to make was that I think any teacher or leader in charge of such a group should be instructed in St. John's Ambulance, and should be able to give first aid in case of accidents, even if they were not hit by a truck.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: My information is that many of our teachers and supervisers are . . . . so instructed. Whether it was so in this case, I do not know. However, it is a good idea.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, before we leave Vote 48, could the hon. Minister tell us whether there is provision in his Estimates for the additional assistance the Government has agreed to give to classes for retarded children? I know there is a Bill in the House now on this question, and I would like to know whether there will be finances available.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SALSBERG: While the hon. Minister is on his feet, could he perhaps indicate to what extent the Government will go in helping with the classes?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In answer to the hon. member, we have an amount in our general grants for elementary education

for retarded children. When this Bill has been proclaimed we propose then to draft regulations under which we shall operate in the interests of these retarded children and their parents.

There is a good deal of information we must still obtain -- numbers of children, the arrangements now in effect -- and it seems to me we cannot take the whole responsibility for these retarded children from the parents; we do the best we can, but it would be a mistake, because parents must continue to have a certain responsibility for these children.

As soon as the Bill has been proclaimed, we shall find out just what the situation is, and shall do our very best to be of assistance to the parents and to such children.

Vote 48 agreed to.

On Vote 49:

MR. HOUCK: May I ask the hon. Minister, under No. 1, is that a fifty-fifty agreement between the Province and the Dominion?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Not quite, Mr. Chairman. This Department provides $220,000 and the Government at Ottawa, $100,000. A little over twice as much is provided by this Government.

Vote 49 agreed to.

On Vote 50:

MR. OLIVER: There was some discussion a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, about the departmental attitude in cutting off the grant for gymnasiums and swimming pools. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, when this edict went out from the Department of Education, how many plans for how many schools were in preparation or were approved by the Department, and at what stage must they have been before they were denied the grants for swimming pools and for gymnasiums?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, may I say if any school board had our approval on February 16th, under the old arrangement, we stand by that approval, whether it is old or new. It seemed to us the proper thing to do. No matter in what stage they were, if they had a letter saying that we approved for grant purposes so-and-so, then that stands.

MR. OLIVER: One more question, Mr. Chairman; in respect to architects, the hon. Minister of Education can inform the House, I am sure, as to what experience the Department has had, if any, in providing school boards with

plans on which they could proceed. That, of course, as the hon. Minister knows, is one of the expensive items in school construction, and it has often seemed to me that if the Department could have plans sent out to the school boards and allow them to pick certain standard plans, a good deal of money could be save. What experience has the Department had in that respect?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: I do not know what the architects might say, Mr. Chairman, but we have had some experience. Some years ago we prepared plans; we thought we would begin at the beginning. The plans were for a one-room school. In the course of four or five years, these plans were shown to every Board, and there were a number who came and asked for information regarding the building of a one-room school. In the whole time, there were only two Boards who would accept them; they wanted something a little different.

MR. NIXON: The architect earns his money, too, in supervising the construction of the school and keeping an eye on it.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Yes, that is often forgotten. The architect does a great deal of

work after the plans are prepared, in seeing that everything is done properly and in good order.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to ask too many things in one hour, but I would like to ask the hon. Minister why the Board of Education of the City of Toronto is now receiving only about 12 per cent -- or rather grants which amount to only about 12 per cent -- of the cost of education; and why does the Board of Education of the City of Toronto experience a steady decline in the amount which the Department is giving that Board? It is a far cry from the 50 per cent of the cost of education that was originally promised.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows that was 50 per cent of the cost presently charged. As a matter of fact that promise wasmore than fulfilled.

MR. SALSBERG: Certainly all the people in the Province --

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member chooses to misunderstand it, but it is quite definite. It says that fifty per cent of the cost now charged against real estate.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am an average

person, and my reaction to things is that of an average person, and, as an average person my reaction to the statement of the Hon. Mr. Drew was that he would pay fifty per cent of the cost of education. I am now asking the reason for the continuous decline in the percentage of grants to the City of Toronto, which, in turn, compels an increase in the school tax rate. It is inevitable. It was 20-odd per cent; then it dropped to 18, then to 15, and last time it was down to 12 per cent.

I think this is as good a time as any for the hon. Minister to make a statement that will cheer the people of this City by telling them that the grants will be higher than they are at present.

Some little time ago, if my memory serves me aright, the hon. Minister of Education expressed surprise when informed that the percentage now is down to 12, and if my memory still serves me aright, the hon. Minister was quoted at the time as saying he would look into the matter. That is quite a little while ago -- not very long -- and I assume the hon. Minister has had a chance to look into it and will now tell us whether he was really surprised, and what he intends to do.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did look into it. These school grants are arranged to help those who need help most. Those who h need help most are people in little remote places where they have a great deal of difficulty in financing their schools. There is one place -- there may be two or three -- where the Department pays 92 per cent of the cost, and the people have a great deal of difficulty wangling the other 8 per cent out of their taxes.

The whole system is arranged to benefit those who need it most, and we try as far as we can to carry out our policy of equal opportunity for everyone.

I know another place, Mr. Chairman, in the neighbourhood of Huntsville where we have been paying 84 per cent, and they are having the greatest difficulty paying theother 16 per cent, and they require two new rooms added to their building.

In the City of Toronto for ten years there was no increase in school population. The grant has something to do with assessment, of course, because a tremendously large assessment means less need of financial assistance.

It also depends on the number of pupils.

We have what we call a "per pupil" grant, and for the past ten years the Toronto school population did not increase at all, but occasionally decreased, until this year when it has increased by 1,600. In doing justice to the small places we could not keep on paying on the original percentage rate, and so it is down now, I think, to 12 per cent, but perhaps it will go up a little now that there is an increase of 1,600 in school population in Toronto. However, Mr. Chairman, we do try to be fair in all these things.

MR. NIXON: Could the hon. Minister tell me what the cost of elementary education is in the Province and what percentage of that cost is covered by the $38.5 million?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: The hon.member for Brant means the total cost of elementary education?

MR. NIXON: Yes, for which you grant the $38.5 million?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: I think we have the answer. $136,500 was the cost in 1951. Is that a satisfactory answer?

MR. NIXON: That is a long way from 50 per cent, is it not?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, that was not for elementary education, was it? I should think that is for everything.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: May I withdraw that, Mr. Chairman? Elementary education, $93,747,000.

MR. NIXON: Yes.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: That comes closer to it.

MR. NIXON: Yes, I was amazed at the first figure the hon. Minister gave us.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Well, that is the answer.

MR. CHARTRAND: Mr. Chairman, are the per pupil grants the same as they were last year, and is there any intention to increase them?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: We are paying grants for expenditures in 1953 for expenditures in 1952; the total grant is $4 million more because of the increase in school population. We are on the same basis.

MR. CHARTRAND: There is no intention of increasing it in the near future?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: If we had more money, we would be glad to.

Vote 50 agreed to.

On Vote 51:

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, Vote 51, "Miscellaneous, to be paid as directed

by the Minister, $28,000." Last year it was $14,000. Was that amount of money spent last year, and could the hon. Minister tell us in what way?

HON. MR. DUNLOP: We have had to increase the grant. For example, a new need arose, and we had a little difficulty meeting it this last year, but we did meet it. There is an organization, with which perhaps the hon. member for Ontario may be familiar, known as the Workers' Educational Association. I suppose I have the honour of being one of the founders of the Workers' Educational Association away back in 1920. It had its ups and downs for various reasons, and for a time was not receiving any grant.

When I took over here, remembering my "child" of years before, I proceeded to do something for it. First of all, I paid off some of its debt out of this miscellaneous grant. Then I restored the grant it used to have, and some other little debts turned up which had not been paid, and I paid them, amounting to a total of something between $6,000 and $7,000. That came out of this fund.

There were students going to India for a seminar this year. The other Provinces have made a grant to these students to assist them, and we felt we should do likewise, and we took $3,500 out of the fund for that purpose, and probably will have something like that again.

It is these special needs which arise which are bona fide and perfectly legitimate cases which we would like to be able to assist.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I shall not repeat what I said a year ago, except to again bring the matter to the fore in the hope that ultimately it will be picked up and made use of. That is the proposal I made a year ago for the establishment of a special branch within the Department of Education to be known as the Branch for Cultural Activities, with a full-time director and with a minimum annual grant of about a quarter of a million dollars, to enable the Department to co-ordinate the various activities that go on in our cultural life in the Province and to assist and stimulate the cultural efforts of our people. That is, to provide scholarships for musicians who write original creative music; to help in the development of dramatic art, particularly in the smaller communities;

to help our struggling artists with special grants, and so on.

(FF-1 follows)

Last year the Government did not see fit to accept the plan immediately, and I might say, Mr. Chairman, in order to win support for my proposal, which I considered, and still consider, to be a very constructive and necessary development of cultural plans in the province, I sent out extracts from my remarks made a year ago on this question to cultural organizations, to artists, musicians and sculptors, and their associations, because I thought the representatives of all these established societies of artists and creative workers of all sorts, should form an advisory committee. I want to say to the hon. Prime Minister I have received very stimulating replies from individuals, and from officers of these art and cultural organizations throughout the province. They think it is a wonderful idea. They agree that struggling composers should be given a grant; they think that Ontario art should be helped and stimulated; they think that provincial theatres should be established. Many of them told me they would get in touch with the Government. I do not know how many got in touch with the hon. Prime Minister.

I leave this without pressing it further in the hope that the hon. Minister of Education will react more kindly than he did a year ago, and

that next year, he will be so friendily disposed to the idea that he will bring in a special item in his Estimates for the establishment of such a branch within his Department.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: Mr. Chairman, I would not like to make quite such a reckless promise, but I would like to assure the hon. member that by the use of these community programmes, we are doing a great deal throughout the country in the way of art, music, and even painting. There is no sculpture, as far as I know. I have always been a believer during my work in education, in beginning in a small way and working up. I found that more satisfactory than beginning in a large way, and sometimes having to work down.

Vote 51 agreed to.

On Vote 52.

MR. PETER MANLEY (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister. I believe in connection with the University of Toronto, they have a school of law, and I believe the students feel they are being discriminated against owing to the fact that they have to spend one more year than they do at Osgoode Hall. I would like the hon. Minister to enlighten me as to why that condition exists, why

they have to take that extra year before they are called to the Bar.

HON. MR. DUNLOP: The standards for legal education, both for admission and the contents of the courses, and everything which has to do with the courses are by statute, and have been for many years -- I think for almost half a century -- in the hands of the Benchers of the Law Society. As long as this Act is in force, it is in the hands of that organization.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, if I may say so, that is hardly a complete answer. As at present, that is true. But it is within the competence of this Parliament to change that. As a matter of fact, there are very important sections of the legal profession, and some of the outstanding educators of this province who are asking this Parliament to change the law, so that a graduate of the law school of the University of Toronto will be permitted to practice the law within this province. I think the Dean of the law school of the University of Toronto says there is a very medieval taboo, carried on by the Priestly Cult of the Law Society of Upper Canada, and many ask, "What do these men feed on, that they can defy this Parliament and defy the

and
University of Toronto,/when they refuse to allow a graduate from the law school of the University of Toronto to practice, he just does not practice. Talk about a closed shop. Any graduate of an apprentice school operated by the Department of Labour, who completes his apprenticeship, is a full-fledged mechanic, and he is accepted. The hon. Minister of Labour knows that. But when a student who studies in one of the leading Universities in the British Commonwealth, and in one of the best schools available, graduates, it means nothing, because the Benchers want to have apprentices to send them for tickets to the theatre, so we are told, to send messages to their wives, to go and pick up hats from the milliners, because the lawyer himself is busy, and does not dare tell his wife he will not do it, when she telephones to him. So he has an articled fellow who does all these jobs, picking up hats, waiting in line for tickets, and so forth. They insist on these medieval conditions, and I am sure the hon. Prime Minister, even though he is a noted member of the legal profession, knows it is the wrong system, and I would ask him to once and for all challenge and break this group. It is a closed shop, as I have said, in the province, and

exercises authority which no labour group would ever dare to do.

When we read what the Dean of the Law School has said, and what the President of the University has said, I really feel it is time something is done. When students of the University of Toronto attending the law school feel compelled to engage in demonstrations, and parade down the streets with banners, I think it is time this House sat up and took notice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who inspired them?

MR. SALSBERG: I think the hon. Minister of Education should ignore that, as I am ignoring the meaningless murmuring which comes from some hon. member in the northeast corner of the House, when he asks, "Who organized them?". The implication, I suppose, is that some Communistic organization organized the students. Let us not be nonsensical about this, and I say to the hon. member, "Grow up; it is time you stopped being so childish".

These students are going to be the lawyers of the future; they will be members of this Legislature, and when they are elected and come here, they will change that law, I can assure you. However, let us not wait for that. I am glad the

hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley) has raised this question, and I am very happy to give him support in urging upon the Government, the necessity for taking action. This Parliament stands above the Benchers of the province of Ontario, and the Upper Canada Law Society. It is all right for them to have the gate which they found necessary when cows wandered in, these idiosyncrasies are quite in order, and somehow or other, people wiggled through, and that is all right. But this is not all right, and is a challenge to create in the University of Toronto a recognized law school, because, after all, it is one of the most excellent law schools on this continent.

Section 52 agreed to.

On Section 53.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): The statutory vote for superannuation is increased by $1 million again this year. Last year, it was $2,900,000, and this year it is $3,900,000, an increase of $1 million. Does that include the money already voted?

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): Of course, the Treasurer has noted the report of the auditor with respect to the superannuation fund. In his last

report, he sets it forth from an actuarial standpoint, and shows the deficit as of 1951 as $93 million, in 1948, $51 million, and in 1945, $11 million.

This is a report by the actuary of the condition of the Teachers' Superannuation Fund, which was made as of June 30th, 1951.

The report states that the net unfunded accrued liability in respect of live pensioners and active teachers, as of July 1st, 1951, amounted to over $93 million; in 1948, the deficit was $51 million; in 1945, the deficit was $11 million.

The meaning of this unfunded liability is that no immediate provision has been made to liquidate it during the service lifetime of the members causing the liability. The report discusses past services, and says that as of July 1st, 1951, the entire present Ontario teachers' body will cost the teachers, or the taxpayers, or both, a sum which has been capitalized at a value of over $93 million. And then he finishes with the statement, "This is a very serious matter".

(TAKE GG FOLLOWS)

It would seem in view of the rapidly spirelling deficit that it surely is very serious and the only solution he can make is that the Government's four per cent contribution should be raised to six per cent. Even if this recommendation is carried out, some $12 million of the present deficit could be directly refunded, leaving over $80 million of the liability unfunded.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr.Chairman, that of course is an actuarial deficit which is academic. I do not think there was any intention of that when the opposition was in office. How much was the amount?

MR. NIXON: In 1945 it was $11 million.

HON. MR. FROST: How much was it in 1941?

MR. NIXON: It does not go back that far.

HON. MR. FROST: The Government underwrites the funds and at the present time I think there is about $75 million in the fund, I am speaking offhand but I think there is about $75 million left in the fund and I think the fund will increase without any additional contribution at the rate of about $1 million a year for the next twenty years, a million dollars doing nothing at all. The fund itself will gradually increase from $75 million to about $95 million twenty years from now, doing nothing.

For the past several years we have been putting in an extra million dollars a year which will mean that every million dollars that is put in will extend the period of time and I should say that before the $75 million plus the $1 million a year, plus our $1 million a year, before it starts to decrease, it will probably be about forty years removed. That ought to be sufficient to remove the hon. member from any element of worry. He has been here for thirty-four years and I hope for another forty while the fund will be increasing. That is the whole picture of the actuarial situation.

I would also like to draw to the attention of the House that the Government makes a 4 per cent contribution to the fund and the teachers pay 6 per cent, but on the other hand as the hon. member opposite well know, the Government is paying the interest on the $75 million invested. I think in some cases it is as high as 2 per cent over the normal level, so that actually the Government's 4 per cent when you really look at it comes to about 6 per cent. The Minister of Education tells me he contemplates raising the Government rate to 6 per cent, and if that is true we will

pay the normal rate of increase which runs less than the rates we are paying. After all I do not think we should put in $1 million a year and pay rates of interest from 1½ per cent to 2 per cent more than the others, and I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) will admit that is on the generous side.

MR. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Before leaving the Department of Education estimates I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop). He has been very fair in answering our questions and shows he has complete control of his Department.

HON. MR. FROST: Of course it is true that sometimes we hear loose statements about the young people of today. I well remember back in the depression days, in the 1930's, when it was said by a great many people that our young people were becoming soft. I also think of their contribution in the second World War, immediately following the great depression, and all of the difficulties they had in those days.

I often think of the great contribution that the youth of our country and, indeed, of the United Kingdom and other countries made in the defence of our liberty. It always makes me feel in these days despite the fact that we have days of change of viewpoint, that after all our young people of today are the best young people the country ever had.

I feel we are prone to say those things. I think perhaps that runs with human beings, the older they get the more tendency there is to say the oung people are going to the dogs, but the truth is that the young people are progressively better, in fact I think all our people are better. I do not see any sign of deterioration in our people at all.

I think just the converse is true and that was proven in the days of the last war. I think it is a good thing the hon. members of this House realize the true facts of the situation, that our young people are really doing a great job, and are going to do a very much greater job in the days to come.

(Page GG 5 follows)

HON. MR. DUNLOP: As Minister of Education I think I should second and supplement what the hon. Prime Minister has said and what the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) has said.

All my life I have had a great deal to do with young people in schools and in universities and in my work as I go through the province on various occasions. I have the highest regard for them as an intelligent loyal group of young people, not only intelligent and loyal but industrious and religious too. They are just the finest sort of prospective citizens that any country could hope to have.

MR. T. PRYDE (Huron): I find it rather difficult to sit here without saying a word on this subject. The hon. Prime Minister made reference to the boys who offered themselves in the last world war. It was my privilege to be engaged for several years as a personnel selection officer in the Air Force, and it was our duty to question them and particularly as to their motives. I can say without hesitation that it was a great privilege to be engaged in that work, and to find out something of the character of those young fellows who went overseas and did such a magnificent job in defending our liberty. That has been proved again when they came back and entered into their studies. I believe they made records

in every respect in their post-war studies and I just want to put myself on record as standing here and saying something on bdhalf of our Canadian young men.

HON. MR. FROST: I move the Committee rise and report certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

The house resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply reports the Committee has come to certain resolutions and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

(HH follows)

On Motions the following Bills were read a third time:

Bill No.1, "An Act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Bishop of Fort William."

Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the Riverside Cemetery Company of Port Arthur.

Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Brantford."

Bill No. 20, "An Act respecting the City of London."

Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Lakeshore District Board of Education."

Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the Hospital for Sick Children."

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bills do now pass and be intituled as in the Motions.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there are some Bills here which might be sent on to Committee where they can receive consideration in the Committees of the House. I am sorry to say we have two casualties in the Cabinet, the H hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas), and today the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell). The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests suffered a severe nose bleed today, and he has had to go to hospital and is

there being patched up.

There are certain Bills here which are more or less routine, which might be sent on. I am going to ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to move the second reading of Bills Nos. 69 and 70.

THE FOREST FIRES PREVENTION ACT

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister) (in the absence of Mr. Gemmell) moved second reading of Bill No. 95, "An Act to amend the Forest Fires Prevention Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

He said: I am ready to have this go to the Committee.

THE FORESTRY ACT

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister) (in the absence of Mr. Gemmell) moved second reading of Bill No. 96, "An Act to amend the Forestry Act, 1952."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways) (in the absence of Mr. Thomas) moved second reading of Bill No. 69, "An Act to amend the

Agricultural Societies Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

He said: This, of course, will go to the Agricultural Committee.

THE AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS ACT

HON. GEORGE H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways) (in the absence of Mr. Thomas) moved second reading of Bill No. 70, "An Act to amend The Agricultural Associations Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE SKI TOWS ACT

HON. L. P. CECILE (Minister of Travel and Publicity) moved second reading of Bill No. 90, "An Act to repeal the Ski Tows Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

ONTARIO SCHOOL TRUSTEES COUNCIL

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 103, "An Act to incorporate the Ontario School Trustees Council."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there are some Bills standing in the name of the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Warrender), the Public Halls Act, the Travelling Shows Act, The Theatres Act. These matters might be better considered in Committee; they are actually not matters of important changes.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I would rather you would leave those three Bills.

HON. MR. FROST: Very well, I shall be very glad to.

GREATER TORONTO ASSESSMENT BOARD ACT

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 85, "An Act to amend the Greater Toronto Assessment Board Act, 1951."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

REGULATION OF ELEVATORS AND CERTAIN OTHER TYPES OF LIFTS

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 87, "An Act to provide for the licensing and regulating of Elevators and Certain other Types of Lifts."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I made some explanation on second reading of the Bill. It is quite self-explanatory, and I would like it to go to the Labour Committee.

(II - 1 follows)

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS ACT

HON. MR. DALEY moved second reading of Bill No. 88, "An Act to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1951".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Chairman, I ask that this Bill be referred to the Labour Committee.

OPERATING ENGINEERS ACT

HON. MR. DALEY moved second reading of Bill No. 89, "The Operating Engineers Act, 1953".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

He said: I would ask that this Bill also be referred to the Labour Committee.

FACTORY SHOP AND OFFICE BUILDING ACT

HON MR. DALEY moved second reading of Bill No. 106, "An Act to amend the Factory, Shop and Office Building Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Chairman, I ask that this Bill be referred to the Labour Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, there are two bills which were to go to the Legal Bills Committee but which on the other hand the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) or some other hon. members may want held.

The first is Bill No. 100, "An act to amend the Summary Convictions Act". That could go to the Legal Bills Committee, Mr.Speaker,. and I would so move, and if there is any objection I will hold it over.

MR. OLIVER: No, if it is going to the Committee, I think that is the best place to consider it.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

HON. MR. FROST, in the absence of the Hon. Mr. Porter, moved second reading of Bill No. 100, "An act to amend the Summary Convictions Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

CREDIT UNIONS ACT

HON. MR. FROST, in the absence of hon. Mr. Porter, moved second reading of Bill No. 101, "The Credit Unions Act, 1953".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I went down the other day to open the Credit Union Convention here and a very large number of people attended, I suppose some four or five hundred, and several spoke to me about this Bill.

The genesis of this Bill, sir, came about in this way, the Credit Unions by reason of an Act introduced in this Legislature and passed here, I am sure it is a dozen years ago -- the first

time I ever heard of a Credit Union, in fact, it was in a Bill in this Legislature which I believe was introduced by the then Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Dewan; that Bill left the administration of the Act in the Department of Agriculture.

We now have something over 700 Credit Unions in the Province and it was felt it would be impossible to deal with them, in fact, the officials of the Department of Agriculture brought the matter up and asked that the administration of the Act be turned over to the Treasury Department, and ultimately it was decided to transfer it to the Department of Insurance, which deals with insurance companies, trust companies and things of that sort.

The matter involved in this Act, Mr. Speaker, is a pure matter of administration. I make this suggestion, perhaps the Bill could be referred to the Legal Bills Committee and we could send for the Credit Union representatives -- I believe Mr. Aubrey Dalgleish of Hamilton is president and chairman of the Society-- and there settle the matter.

I am only anxious to be co-operative and to have the Credit Unions administered in the Department and under circumstances which would assist them, That is the only purpose. In the Department of Agriculture

they are almost overwhelmed with the number now, there are some 700, and it is quite conceivable that in a few years the number may run into thousands. It seems to me it might be referred to the Legal Bills Committee and we could call on the Credit Unions people and see what would be the best thing to do for them. That is the only point I had in mind in the matter.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Chairman, I had not known this Bill was coming up for second reading tonight. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is showing a measure of good judgment at least in suggesting that the Bill be sent to the Legal Bills Committee.

The Credit Unions in this Province, as the hon. Prime Minister well knows, is a rapidly growing organization. It is an organization I think all of us would like to see grow rapidly.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: Now, as I understand the complaint of the Credit Unions themselves in respect to this proposed legislation, the burden of their opposition comes about from the fact that they are to be transferred, as they see it, from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Insurance. They feel, and I think there is some justification for

their attitude, that in the Department of Agriculture there was a minister who was elected in the Province and they were under what might be called a "live" department, whereas if they are put in the Department of Insurance it is just a little different situation. I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) that I can foresee the day when the number of Credit Unions in this Province will easily double what it is at the present time, and I would ask him to give very serious consideration to starting up a particular branch in the Department of Agriculture to deal specifically with the matters concerning credit unions.

I do not know just what attitude one should take in respect to this going to the Legal Bills Committee. I assume that is the proper committee, if it is going to be studied by a committee. And another "beef" of course the Credit Unions people have, is that they said this Legislation was drawn and they knew nothing about it at all, they had no opportunity to make representations. Well, that is to be regretted, Mr. Chairman, if they did not have that opportunity -- and I do not believe they had, when they said no opportunity was presented -- so if it is going to the Legal Bills Committee, let us see to it at least that they have every

opportunity to present whatever evidence they have at their disposal.

In resuming my seat, I would ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) as a matter of Government policy, to seriously consider whether it is advisable or not to place this great and going organization in the Department of Insurance or whether it should be under a minister and in a Department of Government, elected by the people, and as such closely allied to the people.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) is quite right, as indeed are the Credit Union people are quite right in saying, they did not have the opportunity to make representations. As a matter of fact it was only considered as a purely routine matter. The beginning of the Credit Unions really was in connection with matters related to agriculture whereas now, credit unions have very greatly expanded from a limited sphere of agriculture. Credit Unions are a growing force and they are everywhere. We have a Credit Union in our own Civil Service, in fact, there may be more than one. Some of the churches have unions, they are a co-operative association and I may say, that I am heartily and entirely in sympathy with them and my only purpose is to assist them.

I would like the Chairman of the Legal Bills

Committee, the hon. member for York East (Mr. Beckett) to get in touch with Mr. Dalgleish and bring him here to discuss the matter and see what we can do to assist. As a matter of fact, the growth of Credit Unions is quite beyond the organization that has been looking after them.

The tile, The Department of Insurance, to an extent is a misnomer, as my hon. friend knows. That Department deals with trust companies and financial organizations, and it seemed like a better place to build up an organization than where they were. However, I am quite satisfied to discuss that. All I am anxious to do is to try to find ways and means to handle them, do it expeditiously and at the same time help them in any way possible. So, Mr. Chairman, I will leave it with the Chairman of the Legal Bills Committee to iron out.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) that perhaps it would be wiser and maybe more appropriate to refer to the Committee on Agriculture. I have the highest respect for the Committee on Legal Bills but I think you are making the same mistake, you are handing it over to a committee which is concerned with the legal aspect of a piece of legislation, whereas as a matter of good policy, since farm groups are so vitally concerned and it is now part of the Department

of Agriculture, maybe they could discuss the situation more fully in the committee on agriculture and agree on a policy.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this is really a matter of administration and the Department of Agriculture found they were overwhelmed with the number. As a matter of fact, these credit unions are no longer simply agricultural. I suppose a great majority of them are really labour organizations. That is the problem. I would say, sir, I would be very glad to take them under my own wing in the Treasury, but some people accuse me of being hard-hearted when I get into the role of treasurer.

MR. SALSBERG: I just thought they might prefer that Committee, and wanted to help the hon. Prime Minister out.

HON. MR. FROST: In any event, when it comes up here in Committee the House will understand it will get the fullest consideration and if it appears that the situation is unfair, I am prepared to withdraw the Bill and make some other arrangement.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to study the advisability of actually putting this legislation through this year. There cannot be the element of urgency that would necessitate

it goi g through this year and I think perhaps we had better take two or three careful studies in this regard and be sure that when we put it in a house, we have it in the right house.

HON. MR. FROST: I am quite content with that, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Credit Unions, the hon. Prime Minister said they started out as rural,--tthey are really co-operatives -- and now the majority are labour. There are several I have dealings with and they are no longer small business, they are big business and for that reason there might not be the same control exercised over them, and this Bill is just shifting the administration from the Department of Agriculture, where they have not the facilities to take care of them, into a department where they have those facilities. There are no changes in principle nor in the operation of the Credit Union in any way, shape of form .

MR. OLIVER: It sounds quite simple to hear the hon. Minister say it.

Motion agreed to, second reading of the bill.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, before we leave this item of business,

I think we ought to consider what we are doing with a lot of these Bills. Previously we have been considering all bills in the House on second reading. We have adopted this year a new procedure, we are sending them through second reading without any explanation or debate, and then we are sending them to committees.

It is impossible for every hon. member to attend all committees ; it means that just a small proportion of the hon. members will be present at a committee meeting when these different bills come up. Even if we wanted to be present, we could not, because there are several committees meeting on the same day and at the same hour.

I think it is rather a dangerous practice merely to say on second reading: "We are referring these Bills to a committee". I think we should give the Bill the ordinary customary explanation on second reading and then refer it to a committee.

I agree whole-heartedly with the principle of sending them on to a committee, I think that is a good principle, but at the same time I am a little afraid that the practice is getting out of hand in referring these bills to the committee without giving all hon. members in the House the privilege of discussing or debating the principles of the Bills.

HON: MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, while I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Grummett), these are all bills dealing with detail and of course they will come back to the House in Committee again. The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me to hold out certain Bills and I have held out some that there obviously would be debate upon as a matter of principle. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr.Grummett) but if at any time we referred those to the committees and he or any other hon. member desires that they be held ... for a debate on principle, I would be only too glad to do so.

MR. GRUMMETT: There is one way of getting around that, Mr. Speaker, and that is when the Bill comes back to the House and is considered by the Committee of the Whole House, if the rules will permit us to have a little leeway and discuss the principle at that time, I am quite satisfied.

HON. MR. FROST: Agreed; I will do that.

Motion agreed to; House in Committee of the Whole, Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

Y.W.C.A. AND Y.M.C.A. LONDON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-fourth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 5, "An Act to incorporate the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations of London", Mr. Robarts, (London).

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Section 7 as amended agreed to.

Section 8 as amended agreed to.

Sections 9 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 5 reported.

TOWN OF ORILLIA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-fifth Order, House in Committe on Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Town of Orillia", Mr. McPhee.

Section 1 agreed to.

Section 2 as amended agreed to.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Schedule A agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 28 reported.

(Take JJ follows)

THE SECURITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 63, "An Act to amend The Securities Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 63 reported.

THE RESEARCH COUNCIL ACT,1948

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 68, "An Act to amend the Research Council Act,,1948", Mr. Warrender.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 68 reported.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 74, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act", Mr. Daley.

MR. SALSBERG: Would it be agreeable to the Government to have this Bill go to the Labour Committee.

HON. MR. FROST: This has been before the Labour Committee.

MR. SALSBERG: I beg your pardon, the Labour Committee has not met as yet. It would be a good idea, I think.

HON. MR. DALEY: I think we have been very generous with the Labour Committee. This is absolutely fixed. There is nothing for the Labour Committee to do with it.

MR. SALSBERG: They could study it.

HON. MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, I would request that subsection 7 of Section 1 be amended to provide that an employer may be liable on the earnings of workmen who are employed part of the time in Ontario and part of the time in another province of Canada.

This is intended to enable the Workmen's Compensation Board to have reciprocity with other provinces in an endeavour to eliminate the double assessment which is in effect at the present time. That is all the Section is intended to do. It is intended to endeavour to carry out Mr. Justice Roach's request.

Amendment agreed to.

Sections 1 (as amended) to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 74 reported.

THE CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 76, "An Act to amend The Certified Public Accountants Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 76 reported.

THE JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 77, "An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 77 reported.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain Bills, one with amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain Bills without amendments and one Bill with amendment and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

THE MEDICAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Phillips moves second reading of Bill No. 102, "An Act to amend the Medical Act".

MR. OLIVER: I think the hon. Minister should say something on this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, as I explained on first reading, last year we had an Act comparable to this one, at which time we gave internes in general hospitals, the right to write prescriptions within the hospitals for morphine, and other drugs, and also to sign death certificates. These men, of course, are graduate medical doctors.

This year we are simply adding Her Majesty's hospitals in Ontario, which takes in two hospitals, the one at Sunnybrook, in Toronto, and the new Westminster Hospital in London.

MR. SALSBERG: Do we gather from that explanation that up until now, graduate internes did not have the right to perform the duties the hon. Minister now mentions? For a layman, that is rather surprising. One would imagine that if a student graduated from a medical school, he would have this right to sign death certificates and certain prescriptions.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: These men who are internes have not had to join the College of Physicians and Surgeons. This is only within the hospital.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE EMBALMERS AND FUNERAL DIRECTORS ACT

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if this Bill cannot stand over?

HON. MR. FROST: By some strange quirk it was sent to the Health Committee and they have been considering it. I think the hon. Minister might want to legally want to send it to the Health Committee, and when it comes back we might consider the whole Bill in Committee of the Whole House. It got down there ahead of itself.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS moves second reading of Bill No. 105, "An Act to amend the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act", and I would move that it be referred to the Health Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill; Bill No. 105 referred to the Committee on Health.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: May I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that this was before the Health Committee, for which I received permission from this House. There are certain amendments which may be made at the meeting.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that terminates the business for today. Before moving

ONTARIO

Third Session

of the

Twenty-Fourth Legislature

of the

Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XXV

Wednesday, March 18, 1953.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12th 1953, ET SEQ.

Hon. (Rev.) J.C. Davies,
Speaker.

- - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, March 18, 1953.
3:00 o'clock p.m.

And the House having met.

Mr.Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: We are very happy today to welcome students from Lambton Park Public School, Milton Public School and Central School of Brampton. From day to day we have these schools from various parts of the Province and it is our hope that while you are here you will gain something in the way of knowledge and also have an increased interest in the life of the citizens of the Province. We are very happy to welcome the students of these schools today.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. JAMES N. ALLAN (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second Report of the Standing Committee on Education and move its adoption.

CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr.Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk) from the Standing Committee on Education presents its second Report as follows:

> "Your Standing Committee on Education begs leave to present the following as its second report:-
>
> "Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:
>
> Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.
>
> Bill No. 92, An Act to amend the High Schools Act.
>
> Bill No. 94, The School Trustees' and Teachers' Boards of Reference Act, 1953.
>
> "Your Committee begs to report the following Bill with certain amendments:
>
> Bill No. 93, An act to amend The Department of Education Act.
>
> All of which is respectfully submitted.
>
> (Signed) James N. Allan,
>
> Chairman."

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr.Speaker, before the orders of the day I should like to inform the House as to what I think will be

a convenient order of business in the following days.

Tomorrow night we are planning on a night session. I am sorry about last night. I did send a notice but apparently it went astray. I found that hon. members opposite had some grounds for complaint. I did advise the House generally. However, I hope that no irremediable loss occurred because of it.

Next week I wish the committees would arrange their business so if necessary we could meet at two o'clock in the afternoon. There will be no night session on Monday night, but I would like to meet at two o'clock if possible.

In connection with Bill No. 80, as the House knows we have started on Part III. Perhaps the hon. members would like to make a note to that effect. We plan on going ahead immediately; today if there is the opportunity, and tomorrow night, and on Friday with parts III, IV and V.

In going over the Bill quite carefully and the representations which have been made we find that there apparently is very little controversy in Parts VIII, IX, X, XI and XIII. That leaves for consideration

Part VI, Transportation; Part VII, Education; Part XII, Planning, Part XIV, Finances, and Part XV, the general section which has some important implications.

It occurs to me the best method of handling is to follow this course: if we can complete those three parts, III, IV and V, and also the parts about which there is little controversy this week. I do not think there will be much controversy over these from going over the submissions which have been offered by those interested. I think we should be able to do that. This would enable us to spend more time next week on the very important five parts I have mentioned.

If we can complete the consideration of those five parts during next week, it then would give us the balance of the week following in which there are four days, to go back over some of the sections of the Bill for some further consideration. If that be done, the Bill will not be hurried in the last few days, and final consideration could be given a week from Friday, which would give the hon. members ample time to make any changes and to polish the Bill up to strengthen it or to amend it where it might need it.

In connection with the comparatively non-contentious parts of this Bill, if we can dispose of those between now and Friday afternoon, it would provide the time for other important matters which the House might wish to consider and, infact, should consider and we would not be so pressed for time during the coming week.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): I think the outline by the Hon. Prime Minister is moderately satisfactory, at any rate. Could we not meet at two o'clock on each day and avoid as far as possible night sessions? I do not think we should have more night sessions than are really required to carry on our work.

It seems to me, if it meets with the approval of the hon. Prime Minister that we could meet at two o'clock on each day which would give us four hours and which would eliminate the necessity of night sessions.

HON. MR. FROST: I quite agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that night sessions are tiresome and irksome. I think some people compare our situation here in this House with the Ottawa situation where they meet early and sit through the day, but it must be remembered that at Ottawa and in some other places they have not the Committee meetings that our

members must attend. I know it is exceedingly arduous to start at nine o'clock in the morning, as many hon. members have been doing for many days, and then to sit here until eleven o'clock at night, so if we could avoid night sessions next week I would be glad indeed.

There will not be a night session on Monday in any event, and it might be possible to cut down on the remaining three days. We might be able to do that, and I shall be glad to co-operate in every way in that regard. At the same time I do not want to limit the discussion on any subject.

MR. OLIVER: Is the hon. Prime Minister able to tell us of the condition of the two cabinet ministers who are ill?

HON. MR. FROST: I am very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas) spoke in this House two weeks ago on Friday. At that time he was suffering from a cold accompanied by a chill. He proceeded to take the up-to-date remedies such as Penicillin instead of lemonade and other more ancient remedies.

I think he is progressing, but he has been quite seriously ill.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) took rather an unusual attack, a nosebleed which has persisted for some days. He

should have, I suppose, gone to bed earlier, but when the doctors attended him they put him to bed and he has to stay there, I believe the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr.Grummett) has had experiences of that sort and will know the remedy is to remain quiet and do what you are told.

They are both doing well but it will probably be some days before either of them resume their places in the Chamber.

I want to table answers to questions 14 and 75.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Nineteenth Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the Motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr.Speaker, first of all I would like to say that last night in my judgment the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) measured up to his reputation of recognizing the principles of fair play in moving the resolution in this House that certain cruel and unkind observations which had been made previously last evening, should be deleted from Hansard. May I say that in my judgment the hon. member for Niagara Falls measured up to the best definition of a "gentleman."

May I be permitted to say also that yesterday I was very deeply touched by the observations made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) in relation to my father. I should like to tell the hon. members that very often when I return to my riding in Kingston, we have a caucus usually some time on a Sunday afternoon and my father asks me repeatedly how his friends are, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Kennedy) and the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies).

Those of us who came into this House in November of 1951 had a certain amount of inspiration given to us, unknown at the time, by the hon. member for Brant having regard

to his lengthy service in his Legislature, which I understand goes back to when he was twenty-eight years of age. Yesterday it was a very great pleasure on my part to meet the very good and charming wife of the hon. member for Brant. We in this House should never be unmindful of his representations and observations so far as they affect the great principles of democracy, because sometimes we are inclined to forget that he and his wife and the rest of his family, during the last war made the supreme sacrifice by giving for our welfare and freedom, and all it stands for, a great contribution in the person of his son.

It is my privilege today to say a few words with reference to the Budget.

First of all I would like to say there is one particular occasion when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) completely dominates the scene in this House and that is when he brings down his Budget.

I think it is fair to say that the Budget speech by my leader this year was one of dignity and confidence in the future of the Province of Ontario. A boy in his teens could have understood everything he said, and likewise a man of the highest intelligence

would have been stimulated by the clarity and audacity of his speech, and when he sat down there was an ovation such as I have seldom seen equalled.

A growing population has created tremendous problems from the point of view of Municipal Affairs, Highways, Welfare and Education. The best asset of this country is the child, and everything must be done to see to it that as far as possible the boys and girls of today, who will be the men and women of tomorrow, are given a sound and a good education.

As far as the last budget is concerned, generous consideration was shown to my consitituency of Kingston, and I think the Kingston Whig-Standard, under date of March 13, through its editorial columns, correctly stated the feelings of the people of this Province when they said in part:-

> "Mr.Frost's Tenth Budget: The new Ontario budget is the tenth since the Pro ressive Conservatives took office in 1943, and the tenth to show a surplus. Premier Leslie Frost, as Provincial Treasurer, has presented all of them and, while doing so, has budgeted for the expenditure of more money than all Provincial Treasurers who preceded him. It has been a gratifying decade for the people of Ontario, and there will be continued gratification that the 1953-54 budget forsees at least maintenance of the

> level of prosperity, higher expenditures for most Provincial works and services, and another balance on ordinary account."
>
> "The Hon. Provincial Treasurer's tenth budget adds to a long record of excellent stewardship. Ontario's financial affairs have been, and are, receiving most capable and sound direction, and its financial position and credit rating are excellent."

I would like to say a word in connection with the City of Kingston which is in my riding and I want to make particular observation on the fact that Kingston is what is called "Military Area Headquarters". Just across from my riding commence the boundaries of the riding of the hon. member for Addison-Frontenac (Mr. Pringle). In that area there is established the great Barriefield military camp attended by the Engineers and Signal Corps.

Thousands upon thousands of men in the armed forces are there for training. There are men who have returned from active service as well while being in the 27th Infantry Brigade, or they are there with the Infantry Brigade after having represented this country in Korea.

There is the Royal Military College which has a great number of young men in their 'teens, who may go into the Army, the Navy or the Air Force. Indeed, when they graduate from that fine institution, they may go to one of our universities and finally go into one of

the professions, sciences or business. In my riding is established the Dominion College, for the Dominion of Canada and the Staff College for the Dominion of Canada. In these two institutions are represented the nerve-centre of the top military men of the Army, Navy and the Air Force who are being trained in the event of an unfortunate war for which we must all be prepared to take our place at the helm. There are also nursing sisters who are on the staff of the Medical hospitals in my riding. It seems to me they are entitled to know my views in relation to where I stand concerning the threat that might involve all the people of the armed forces presently stationed in the area of Military Headquarters in Kingston. They are entitled to know where I stand with relation to Communism, because that is my riding and they are entitled to know my views on that subject.

Joseph Stalin is dead. At his doorstep must be laid the millions of victims claimed by famine. On Stalin's conscience, if he had any, / should lay the burden of shame for the enslavement of millions in the forced labor camps, and for the semi-enslavement of the millions of workers chained to the factories by legislative fiat. From his example of deceit and falsehood came

the inspiration for the world of lies in which the Communistic-ruled peoples of the world live today. For the realization of his ambitions for world conquest, he dared to throw away the good-will his people had earned abroad during the second world war, and plunge the world into the greatest armament race ever known. He wore the mantle of the high priest of Utopian Communism, but his rule possessed reality most reminiscent of Hell on earth.

I would be a hypocrite to say that I regret Stalin's passing. If he had so willed, the world today could be going through an era of confidence, hope and prosperity, such as has never been known. If he had so willed, the marvellous gains of science, technology and scholarship could have been applied fully to caring for the sick, feeding the hungry and extending man's dominion over all nature for the benefit of all humanity. But he did not so will, and our grandchildren will still be paying the price for the evil which he brought into the world.

(Take B follows)

UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT FUND

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer, I want to discuss a matter which I think is of tremendous interest not only to this House but indeed to the motoring public of the province of Ontario, and that is the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

When those of us who drive a motor car get our license, we pay $1.00 and that represents insurance in the amount of $5,000 per person that may be in one's car if personal injuries are suffered as a result of the negligence of another driver. The $5,000 can be made up of damages to your motor car, personal injuries to yourself, pain and suffering, loss of wages, hospitalization and doctors' accounts. The same items for damages would apply to passengers in your car with the one exception that only one claim can be made for the damages to the motor vehicle.

Now, this $5,000, or whatever the damages may amount to in relation to the said sum of $5,000, is only paid out of the Unsatisfied Fund if the defendant is not financially worth the amount of the judgment and costs of the Court as awarded against him. A negligence action is not a complicated lawsuit. The Highway Traffic

Act is the basis of all pleadings in reference to a claim for damages as a result of motor cars coming together. The Act is clear enough but should be amended and I will give you my view on what the amendments should be in a few minutes.

The advertisements in reference to all motor cars today, as I read them and understand them, seem to impress upon the mind of the would-be purchaser of a motor car the horse-power he is getting in the new vehicle, which means speed, and excessive speed per se, generally speaking, can be in most cases negligence in law.

The hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) the other day said in his speech, thoroughly and carefully prepared, that we should take steps as far as possible to see that the accidents, accompanied by very often tragic personal injuries and death on our highways, are cut down. The statement by the hon. member for Niagara Falls was confirmed and corroborated in a statement by the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) in his statement.

I want to make it very clear that the preparation of any negligence action, as far as motor cars are concerned, is not the sort of thing which causes any lawyer very much concern or

worry because negligence is a question of fact, and it is for the jury to say whether or not the plaintiff or defendant were wholly and solely to blame for an accident, or proportionately to blame -- in other words, split the negligence, for example, 25 percent against the plaintiff, 75 percent against the defendant.

Any litigant who may be involved in a motor car damage action does not require the top lawyers of the province to present his case, because in the main the plaintiff's case can be made out by calling the investigating police officer, who can give his evidence in relation to skid marks on the highway, to establish the point of impact, and may I say, in the main, police evidence carries great weight with judges and juries, and quite properly so.

If a plaintiff is successful he is entitled to his costs. A writ can be issued in either the County Court, which has a limited jurisdiction -- I think it is $800 or $1,000 in a damage action -- or in the Supreme Court where there is no limit in relation to what can be claimed in damages. If the plaintiff is successful in a County Court action he gets County Court costs, and likewise if he is successful

in the Supreme Court he gets Supreme Court costs.

I should tell you that in relation to costs they are broken up into two groups -- "party and party" and "solicitor and client". "Party and party" costs are those which can be taxed by a plaintiff against the defendant. Besides this sum, the solicitor for the plaintiff is entitled to tax a further amount called "solicitor and client costs", which are to be paid by his own client to him.

Under Section 108A of the Highway Traffic Act, it states that no amount should be charged or received either directly or indirectly for legal services in connection with any application or action out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, other than the amounts as taxed on a solicitor and client basis. In other words, if a solicitor for the plaintiff taxes costs as between party and party at say $100, and he taxes his solicitor and client's costs at $150, if he is paid his $100 out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, then he can only collect from his client a further $50.

As the hon. members know, Mr. Speaker, the medical profession, from amongst themselves, elect each year their own governing body. We, the

solicitors of the province of Ontario, from amongst ourselves elect those of our profession whom we wish to govern us, and they are known as the "Benchers" of the Law Society of Upper Canada. One of the Sub-Committees of the Benchers is known as the Discipline Committee, and they have power to discipline any member of the profession who is guilty of professional misconduct. I have made it a point to make inquiries from friends of mine who are Benchers, and my information is that certain members of the legal profession, who may/be known to the hon. Attorney-General, have from a judgment paid out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, taken for their fees an amount greater than their solicitor and client costs, and the Discipline Committee of the Benchers has refused to discipline these solicitors, which in my opinion is bad, and this course of conduct in my judgment cannot be justified by the Benchers.

I regret the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is not in his place in the House this afternoon, but I earnestly suggest to him that he make firm representations on the part of the motor vehicle owners of the province of Ontario, to the Discipline Committee of the Benchers, to see to it that no solicitor ever takes any amount from a judgment paid out of the Unsatisfied Judgment

Fund, over and above what he is paid as "solicitor and client" costs.

Cases such as this have come up; solicitors have offended, and nothing has been done about it. And nothing brings a great profession into greater contempt and ridicule than to have some of our number encroach upon and act in a manner contrary to the statute as it presently exists.

I want the hon. members never to forget that a plaintiff in a lawsuit always has the right to collect his costs against the defendant in the action, and what I want to discuss today particularly, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the costs which are being paid to the solicitors out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

Mr. Speaker, before I forget, may I suggest that it may be said by some of my colleagues that I have had little to do to make this speech, and comment on the reasonswhy I should criticize some of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I made up my mind when I gave up my good law practice in Kingston that I was going to be the captain of my own soul, and do my duty as I saw it. If I think there is a course of conduct which deserves censure, then I propose to place that censure on the shoulders of

those deserving it.

---Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

MR. NICKLE: I would ask the hon. Minister of Highways and the hon. members of this House to listen carefully to the points I will make, in order that they may have full information in regard to the matter I am discussing this afternoon.

There is no hon. member of the Government for whom I have a higher regard than the hon. Minister of Highways, who has done and is doing in reference to his Department a magnificent job for the travelling public who use our roads in the province of Ontario, but I am frank to say that the question of legal costs as paid by his Department to greedy solicitors has got out of hand.

There are two classes of judgment as far as the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund is concerned, one is called a Class "A" judgment which is recovered against a known driver and/or owner, but uncollectible, and the other is called a Class "B" judgment which is recovered against an unidentified owner or driver.

It may be interesting to know that from July 1st, 1947, until December 31st, 1952, there were 1,248 Class "A" judgments amounting to $2,346,005.85, and the taxed costs amounted to

$593,553.92 or 25.30 percent of the judgments, and in relation to the "B" judgments, there were 147 cases where the damages in the judgments amounted to $383,202.49 and the taxed costs were $71,595.95, or a percentage of costs against judgments of 18.68.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose if some of the solicitors in the Department of the hon. Attorney-General, or the solicitors in the employ of the Department of Highways, were to say as much as I have said this afternoon, or to say as much more as I intend to say on this subject, they probably would be asked by the active members of my profession, "What business have you to interfere in what an active practioner receives in active practice", and I venture to say he would not long be on the payroll of the civil service of the province of Ontario.

I do not care what the solicitors in the Department of the Attorney-General think about it or what the solicitors in the Department of Highways think about it, the views I am expressing today are my own, and my own solely, and I think the time has come when this situation should be faced.

Before I entered the public service in November, 1951, a great deal of my time was spent in the Courts. I think the Courts, outside of my wife and family, were my first love. However, you become inoculated with this disease called "politics" and since my entrance into public life, I am not so sure which I love the more, the Courts or politics. I think, in any event, Mr. Speaker, I am slipping a little.

It does not do my disposition any good when a member of my profession says, "We have a judgment, and we will be paid out of the 'Santa Claus fund'"of the Province of Ontario, otherwise known as the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. That is not good enough. The time is coming, as I say, Mr. Speaker, -- and I say this with complete and absolute confidence in the hon. Minister of Highways and the hon. Prime Minister -- when there will have to be a revamping of the costs paid to members of the legal profession.

I would like to give you a few examples of what I mean by the "vicious legal costs" which are claimed by lawyers for payment out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I do not want to be accused, when I have finished my address, of having taken a "pot shot" at the lawyers of Toronto, in

the northern part of Ontario, or in any other place.

The first example is the worst of the lot, and it comes from Kingston. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be accused of playing favorites.

This was a case, Mr. Speaker, where an action was instituted by a lawyer in Kingston claiming damages in regard to a motor car accident, amounting to $7,500. What he actually received by way of judgment was only $56.95. The defendant had a good lawyer -- I was it. The thing which annoyed me at the time, and still does, about this case, is that the costs which Mr. Justice Judson, in January of this year, ordered to be paid, amounted to -- what do you think? $999.31. This on a judgment which only amounted to $56.95. That is not good enough. I heard the hon. Prime Minister say in this House that the Provincial Treasurer, is looking for ways and means to curtail expenses. It was suggested yesterday with great forensic ability by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) that we did not have a surplus. May I say, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion if we cut down on some of these legal costs, we might secure a small credit on the right side of the ledger.

The next case is one entitled Gordon vs.

Small. As the hon. members in this House who are practicing law know, whether they practice in Toronto or at any place across the length and breadth of this province, every week we receive a little pamphlet called "The Ontario Weekly Notes" and in each pamphlet are all the reported cases which have been heard -- perhaps not all of them, but all cases of worth-while interest to the legal profession, giving the name of the Judge, the style of the cause, the amount of damages, and so forth. If any hon. member is interested, when the House rises, I am quite prepared to show you a copy of this little book, so you may know from where I get my information.

Regarding this case of Gordon vs. Small; this was an action tried in the Supreme Court of Ontario on the 7th and 8th days of May, 1952, at Toronto. The case was heard by Mr. Justice McLennan. The judgment was for $949.00, and the "party and party" costs paid out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund amounted to $889.60.

Here is another one, Wood vs. Watson, tried at Belleville by Mr. Justice Wells, in February, 1952. The judgment was for $800.00 and the "party and party" costs paid from the Unsatisfied

Judgment Fund amounted to $875.75.

Then, still another, the case of Treftlin vs. Donovan, tried at Hamilton by Chief Justice McRuer, in April, 1952. The judgment amounted to $2,666.67, and the "party and party" costs amounted to $918.10. These costs were out of all proportion to what the lawyers should have been paid, having regard to what they obtained from the verdicts of the Courts.

Mr. Speaker, I said a little while ago that the Ontario Weekly Notes are published, from which I have secured much information.

Now I want to bring this to the attention to the hon. Minister of Highways; he may not be acquainted with it, and I see no reason why he should have knowledge of it, because he is not a lawyer, no matter how capable he is, or how diplomatic in his approach to the affairs of a difficult Department. I think, Mr. Speaker, there may be a few things in relation to the law with which he is not acquainted. Here is a case tried the other day in Toronto, where a judgment was awarded for $3500. to a little girl who was badly injured in a motor car accident. Her father sued for hospitalization, doctors, and so on -- what are called "out-of-pocket" expenses, he being

the adult plaintiff.

The father was awarded $649.05. Mr. Speaker, it does not take a second-year lawyer much time to prove damages. You either have a broken leg or you have not; you have an injured rib, or you have not, and it is for a Judge alone, or a Judge and Jury to assess the damages.

In this case, which was tried by the Chief Justice of this province, Honourable Mr. Justice McRuer, he very wisely, in my opinion, directed that the $3500. should be paid into Court to the credit of this little girl. The costs amounted to $1,048.80 and the adult plaintiff received $649.05. Would you not think that was enough for any solicitor, but he made a motion for leave to deduct out of the little girl's money, which was paid into Court, a further sum representing his"solicitor and client" costs, and the Chief Justice, in his wisdom, refused the application of the solicitor.

The case went to the Court of Appeal, and the Court of Appeal ruled that the solicitor had the right to make the application to the Court to deduct some proportionate amount from the share awarded to the youngster, which the Chief Justice had directed should be paid into Court.

What I want to say to the hon. Minister of Highways this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is if at any time, he, or any of his departmental officials, ever have come to their attention, by way of a judicial notice, any action referring to an infant's share, at no time should he , or his officials ever consent to any solicitor interfering with that sum, which is going into Court -- for what purpose? that if the day comes when a youngster -- an infant, under the age of 21 years -- is not enjoying good health, and needs surgical attention as a result of his or her injury, the money to defray the expenses is in Court, and can be paid out upon application to a Supreme Court Judge. I say the hon. Minister should never allow any share of the infant's money to be whittled down to meet the request of what you might call "greedy lawyers".

I suppose, as a result of what I am saying today, I may be put somewhat in the position of Daniel in the Lions' Den. Someone asked a question at one time, "Why did Daniel have such a smile when he was in the Lions' Den?", and the reply was, "The only reason he was happy was because he knew it would not be very long before he would have / nothing to say".

It is true, I may have to answer for some of the things I am saying, but I prefer to say what

should be done in relation to these costs.

It is all very well to make a critical or cynical speech. It is easy to criticize, but I do think there is some responsibility on me to face the facts, and say what I think the answer is. Were I asked, this would be my answer: First of all, a certificate should be secured from the Courts, stating how long the solicitor was in Court in the case, and may I say, if I were in the shoes of the hon. Minister of Highways -- although I never expect to be, and I hope he remains where he is for a long time, to deal with these situations -- and to him I venture this suggestion, which I think would have the unanimous approval of every hon. member in this House, that the hon. Minister set up a taxing board from which there is no right of appeal. In the law business, as the hon. members know, if one does not like the verdict of a judge or jury, he can go to the Court of Appeal. But, after all, we are paying out money in costs to an amount which equals too great a percentage, as compared with the dollars paid in by the motor car owners of this province.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I would get a certificate, stating how long the lawyer was in

Court, and I would find out how much he claimed, and how much he wanted, and find out what is going on, and then I would adopt a policy of "$1.00 paid out for $1.00 earned". That would be my policy, and I do not think the hon. Minister could go far wrong on that score.

(TAKE C FOLLOWS)

But it does seem to me that basically, sincerely, in his wisdom and in his best discretion, he has established a magnificent fund, but it has got out of hand in relation to solicitors' costs and the time has now come for peremptory action. With my faith in the Government, having regard to some of the observations I have made this afternoon, I know there will be something done.

It may be said that certain hon. members of this House might have made the same speech I am making, and would probably have made a better job of it, but if some farmer had made the speech, members of the legal profession would have said: "Why doesn't he mind his own business and confine his attention to the first six inches of top soil?" Had it been a man in industry, they would have said the same thing, but I can find nothing save sincerity when a man has the courage -- and it requires a little courage, may I say -- to get up in this Legislature and tell his colleagues in his profession that they are doing wrong.

Mr. Speaker, may I say a word in connection with a matter which has been in the newspapers for some time? That is the story about the man Ronald Power, who was incarcerated for some six or seven months. It has been said, and

it has grown up as a tradition, that the King can do no wrong. That point of view has been whittled down, has been narrowed, because there is legislation on the statute books of this Province whereby one can sue the King -- or now the Queen -- in the right of Canada, as represented by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter).

If a man is incarcerated wrongly, and has been done an injustice, it seems to me there should be some fund set up to give him reasonable compensation for the embarrassment he may have suffered. I have here a circular entitled, "You and Your Lawyer", which was issued by The Law Society of Upper Canada, and it is headed: "Until Proved Guilty", from which I read the following paragraph:

> "Some people think the only function of our Courts is to punish the guilty. But even more important is the responsibility to protect the innocent."

That is a fair, honest, sincere approach to the administration of justice. Not for one moment, Mr. Speaker, do I desire to be understood as saying this man Power was keeping good company, because I do not think he was; I think he was "riding for a fall", but it is not the company one keeps, it is one's principles in public life

whichcounts; it is your approach to the worth-while things that makes life worth living, and that is what is behind my observations. In a case such as this perhaps there should be some sole discretion,without the right of appeal, in the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), to give some sort of compensation to a man who has gone through an experience such as this.

Let me be quick to say, Mr. Speaker, that the front page editorial of Saturday Night, with reference to my colleague the hon. Attorney General, went far wide of the mark,in my humble opinion, of what I think is fair in public criticism of a public servant.

There are two observations I wish to make to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), and probably the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) and the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) will fall in line with these observations, since they both made able speeches about highway accidents.

There is a section in the Highway Traffic Act which I think is bad, and that is in relation to the flicking or flashing amber lights at all four corners of an intersection after midnight. I believe it is common knowledge that when two

cars approach an intersection at one and the same time, the car on the right is presumed to have the right of way. There have been suggestions that the "amber" section should be pared down, and should read somewhat as follows:

> "When an amber light is flashing at all four corners of an intersection and when two cars approach that intersection at the same time, they must enter that intersection with caution; and that the said section shall not be subject to subsection (1) of Section 41."

That is the right-of-way section. I believe the public is entitled to have that information because so many people think that just because they are on the right of an intersection they may go through, no matter what happens, and I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Highways that after consultation with his law officers he should amend that Section in order to make it safer for highway traffic -- and I know, Mr. Speaker, that is what he is interested in.

There is another improvement in the Highway Traffic Act I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) for what it is worth, and I think there is some merit in it.

There is a Section which says when a

vehicle approaches a through highway and comes to a full stop, the driver, if he is on the right, has all the rights of a man in such a position. With through traffic travelling our highways as it does today, Mr. Speaker, -- the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile) said the other day there are 17,000,000 tourists who come into this province last year -- it seems to me that the Section in regard to the operator of a motor vehicle who is coming from a side road onto a through highway should be deleted, and that it be provided he can only enter the through highway, whether he be on the right or left of through traffic, provided he can do so in safety. If I were administering the Act, I would put an obligation on the man coming from a side road and entering a through highway to use more than ordinary caution; I would have him exercise -- if I may say so -- extraordinary caution because that extra caution will save many a life and a tremendous amount of personal injury.

I suggest those two amendments to the hon. Minister of Highways, and I think they are sound. The more the public know their rights, the more they will rely on them, and, unless the hon. Minister has some amendment to the Act about

which I know nothing, the law at present is that the man on a side road, if he is on the right of traffic and has once come to a full stop, may shoot through. I think a heavy onus should be placed on him, and I believe such an onus would save a great many lives, many serious personal injuries, and a large number of cars being wrecked.

Another point I wish to raise is that solicitors coming from small county towns -- as did the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) -- who have a small practice consisting mostly of poor clients and are trying to make a decent, small, honest living, find it rather expensive when they want to sue an infant in a motor car action, where damages are great, to have to pay a Toronto agent to get an order from a Judge sitting in weekly court for leave for the appointment of a guardian ad litem. The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) nods his head; he knows exactly what I mean, but I may explain it is an order of the Court to name a man to act for an infant -- that is, for a boy or girl under the age of twenty-one years.

Those are not difficult orders to obtain, but as the hon. Prime Minister knows from the days when

he was practising in Lindsay, the amount of work in weekly Court in Toronto was in his day, and is now, expensive and heavy, and I do suggest to the hon. Prime Minister, in the absence of the hon. Attorney General, that representations be made to the Rules Committee -- that is, Supreme Judges who draw up our rules -- that the Official Guardian should consent to the giving of an order for the appointing of a guardian in a Supreme Court action, on application to the local or the County Judge, and thus save the litigants in the little towns those heavy expenses. After all, is not this great Party with which I am associated interested in the little man, and is that not the reason we are here?

Finally, may I say, Mr. Speaker, one of the great things the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has done this year is to make unrestricted grants to municipalities. Again I turn to the City of Kingston and to that outstanding, fearless, intelligent and honest "Whig-Standard", which says:

> "The important thing is that the Frost Government has taken a giant stride towards relieving the financial burden and relieving the worries that were seriously

> oppressing the municipalities of Ontario. It is an especially welcome development to a municipality -- "

That is, Kingston.

> " -- afflicted with the financial headaches attendant upon annexation, as Kingston is today."

Mr. Speaker, I have turned over in my mind time and time again whether or not I would make the speech I have made today. I did it because I believed it was needed; I did it because I believed it was honest to do so, and had I not, I would have been misjudged. Here I am, and I have made it.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon.member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) on his very fine speech. I not only enjoyed it, but being a layman, I particularly enjoyed his remarks concerning the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, about which I may have something to say later on in my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate also the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on the presentation of his tenth budget. It is always a pleasure to listen to someone speaking on a subject with which he is thoroughly conversant. The hon. Prime Minister, with his broad knowledge of the financial affairs of the Province, is to be congratulated on his able presentation. During the course of his remarks he stated this was the tenth successive year the Province has shown a surplus, and he said it was the result of good government. The hon. Prime Minister is reputed to be a modest man, but I do think he could have given some credit to the initiative and hard work of the people of Ontario.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), when speaking in the debate in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, said:-

> "We will no doubt receive such good news from Ottawa that it will overwhelm, overcome and overshadow what the hon. Prime Minister and myself may say this afternoon."

He was referring to the Federal budget. We all listened eagerly to the radio that evening. Some called it a "sunshine budget", and others a "pre-election budget." Mr. Speaker, I think it was a sunshine budget; they cut taxes with a vengeance. It means sunshine with not a cloud in the sky for the corporations. Regarding the cut in corporation taxes, the Labour Research , a monthly bulletin published by the Research Department of the Canadian Congress of Labour, had this to say:

> "The Federal Finance Minister has cut corporation income tax by $97,000,000 for the coming year and $136,000,000 for a full year. If there had been no cuts, total corporation income tax for 1953-54 would have come to $1,325,000,000."

That figure is taken from Hansard, February 19th, page 2123. Of this figure $97 million represents a cut of 7.3 per cent, and $136 million a cut of 10.2 per cent. It is estimated that the profits of the corporations for last year will be well over two and a half billion dollars.

According to a statement made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in this Assembly, the corporations received a reduction on taxes

of between two and a half and three and a half per cent, through the Federal-Provincial taxation agreement of last year. That reduction was retroactive to the 1st of January, 1952, and now the corporations are to receive a reduction from the Federal government. One can quite understand why the corporations are so very friendly to the Governments at Ottawa and Queen's Park.

With the help of the Liberal Government at Ottawa and the Conservative Government at Queen's Park, the corporations in Ontario have received a substantial cut in taxes, and,yet, Mr. Speaker, according to Taxation statistics, issued by the Federal Government for 1952, the corporations in Ontario alone made over a billion dollars in profits for the year 1951. It certainly was a sunshine budget for them, and, Mr. Speaker, I would hazard a guess they were quite anxious and eager for this Government to agree with the Federal Government respecting the taxation agreement of last year. This was one time, Mr. Speaker, when persistence "paid off".

When the hon. Prime Minister introduced his Budget last year, he estimated for a surplus of $88 million. When the Assembly was in Special Session last October, almost seven

months of the fiscal year had passed by. He knew then he would have quite a surplus, so he asked hon. members to vote $20 million to the highway reserve. That would help to whittle it down a little. Even then, last week he was able to show a $30 million surplus.

The Conservative Opposition at Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, is critical of the record surplus of the Federal Government, but the truth is, it is very difficult for any Finance Minister, during these very buoyant times, to forecast with any degree of accuracy what the surplus is likely to be. While revenues are expected to increase, if the present prosperous times continue, the reverse would happen if there was a downward trend in industry.

This year's record surplus is to be disposed of by last minute grants contained in the Supplementary Estimates. Mr. Speaker, I find no fault with that as long as we are satisfied that the surplus funds are going where they are needed most.

I would like to say a few words concerning highways. I am sure every hon. member is concerned with the congestion of our highways. With the increase in vehicular traffic, there is

need for improvement. According to the Estimates presented to this House last week, the revenue of the Department of Highways for the fiscal year ending March 1954 is expected to be $99,050,000. The Government this year intends to spend $153 million on highways, which would include $42 million on capital account. I presume the additional $20 million voted at the special session last October, and the $10 million voted on Monday, is included in the $153 million. Even so, Mr. Speaker, for this year $54 million will have been taken from the general revenue of the Province to allow the Department of Highways to expend this amount of money.

I do feel, Mr. Speaker, the Government should pay some attention to other needed services. We all appreciate the assistance given to hospitals in the form of increased grants. The need for improved highways is indeed great, but so is the need for an increase in hospital accommodation for the people of Ontario.

A very fine editorial appeared in the Globe and Mail of March 13th, which reads as follows:

> "This is a very large sum to draw from the Ontario motoring public, especially when it is realized that high cost express highways are chiefly for the benefit of commercial trucking. In fact, so substantial has this business grown that, in effect, it determines the specifications of almost every new road in the Provincial Highways system. The time is at hand when the existing method of motor taxation should be revised, to throw more of the burden on those who benefit most from smooth, high-speed roads."

I may say the large sum of $153 million is not met by the motoring public; some portion of it is taken out of general revenue.

When presenting Bill No. 80, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) stated that on taking office on the 4th of May, 1949, he was motivated by a desire to see houses built for the people of Ontario, and is reported in Hansard as saying:

> "Housing plans were at a dead end and progress was not being made, this despite the fact that by then a great deal had been accomplished in Federal-Provincial arrangements. It is fair to state that comparatively less progress had been made in the Toronto area than any other area."

Mr. Speaker, I know it is sometimes difficult to get local councils to appreciate

the difficulties; they, too, have responsibilities respecting housing, and I think this is understandable. Last week I looked through the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year ending 1951. The increase in debenture debt for the municipalities for the years 1947 to 1951 inclusive were as follows:

1947	$5,278,000
1948	22,395,000
1949	35,824,000
1950	67,478,000
1951	91,993,121

This shows an increase 16 times greater in 1951 than in 1947. The hesitancy of local councils, in the light of those figures, is understandable. They are fearful of what might happen in the future.

The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) recently stressed the need for action in home construction, and I would like to commend the hon. member for his sincerity. Representing, as he does, an industrial riding, I am sure he appreciates the need for action. All hon. members of the Legislature are concerned with this problem, for with the falling off in home building last year and the increase of approximately 100,000 Canadians, the situation is

becoming grim. The hon. member for Riverdale had discussed the question of housing with the Federal member of his riding, and after some consultation with builders they concluded it was possible to build decent homes for $8,650. The down payment would be $865, and carrying charges would be at the rate of $53 per month.

The scheme, in my opinion, has some merit. I am sure many people would be very happy to take advantage of it, and acquire a home of their own, but how many are in a financial position to take advantage of this scheme? How many can afford a down payment of $865 and a carrying charge of $53 per month?

(D-1 follows)

Mr. Speaker, I want to give to the members of the Assembly some figures to show that quite a number will not be able to even take advantage of the suggestion of the hon. member for Riverdale. The Hon. David Croll, M.P., speaking in the House of Commons on housing, said seventy-five per cent of the wage-earners in Canada earned less than $3,000 per year. Mr. Speaker,I want to give an even greater breakdown than that, and the figures are published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the 1951 census. In urban areas 5.2 per cent earn under $1,000; 20.4 per cent earn between $1,000 and $2,000; 26.1 per cent between $2,000 and $2,500. This means that 51.7 per cent earn less than $2,500 per year. In rural areas the percentages are even lower -- 16.9 per cent under $1,000; 32.6 per cent between $1,000 and $2,000; 21 per cent between $2,000 and $2,500 - a total of 70.5 per cent. Figures published on February 1, 1952, by the Toronto Welfare Council give a minimum of $200 a month as the amount required for a family of five living in a five-room house, and, Mr.Speaker, the important thing to bear in mind is that the figure of $200 per month does not include rent, insurance and savings.

The Toronto Welfare Council is a very responsible organization and they have made a very careful study of the situation. I think it is recognized that a man or woman should not pay more than 25 per cent of their income for rent or as payments if buying a home.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister when speaking in this Assembly in February of last year, stated he was enthusiastic about rental purchase of homes in government aided projects and I quote:

> "I would rather lose money on a plan of that kind than on direct rental housing"

Now, sir, housing is not a political issue, it is a national need -- it is Canada's No. 1 problem, and I do hope the Hon. Prime Minister will give leadership, vigorous leadership, if you will, and do something for those people in the low income groups who cannot do very much for themselves.

MUNICIPAL GRANTS

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to refer to the assistance given to the municipalities. Local councils today are experiencing a very trying time. With industrial growth and expansion, increasing populations, and demand for services, the situation necessitates some serious thinking.

Debenture debts are increasing, as I mentioned earlier, according to the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs. Some days ago the members received the interim report of the Provincial-Municipal Committee. The Committee recommended the grants on Fire and Police protection should be discontinued. The government had, previously to the presentation of the report of the Committee, declared its intention respecting the previous legislation. I am very pleased to know that, although the Committee recommended otherwise, the compulsory arbitration, pensions and compensation features are to be continued. I think that was a very wise move and I agree wholeheartedly with the Government in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, I will admit that the Act did achieve certain things such as standardization of equipment. This is most desirable in the case of national emergency, but the grants on Fire and Police, on a population basis, were criticized by the Opposition, including myself, when the Bill was introduced in 1949. Even the hon. Premier said:

> "The fact is they have never produced satisfaction."

The Provincial-Municipal Committee, in recommending the unconditional grants, stated:-

"Realizes that unconditional per capita grants do not present a completely satisfactory system of municipal assistance. The Committee also believes in the principle of uniform assessment."

HON.MR.FROST: I think the hon. member should read all of that. It is hardly fair to take part of it.

MR. THOMAS: I think it is fair enough. It is in their recommendation.

HON. MR. FROST: They give reasons. One of the great problems I plan to discuss with the House next week after we get through the Toronto Bill, is to find a method upon which to base the unconditional grants. The hon. member is making a very thoughtful address, I can see, and I am sure he will recognize the fact there are many methods of assessment. You can take the percentage of cost, you can take many things.

It is a very difficult matter to find the right method of assessment. I would like to say that the prrsent legislation which will be discussed in a few days will show it is based upon a scientific assessment of the situation. I will admit it does not produce equality everywhere but it is the closest approach to equality which has ever been advanced in the province.

MR. THOMAS: I agree with the hon. Prime Minister that there is a great difficulty,

but I was going to come to that during the course of my remarks. I think it is fair to quote the conclusions of the Committee. I think most of the members of this assembly are quite aware of the reasons for setting up the Committee and the reasons for it issuing the interim report.

In recommending the unconditional grants, the Commission stated:

> "Realizes that unconditional per capital grants do not present a completely satisfactory system of municipal assistance. The Committee also believes in the principle of uniform assessments throughout the province as an aid towards designing of a more realistic basis for determining municipal need and capacity to pay".

The Committee recommends that a province-wide uniform system of assessment be established.

HON. MR. FROST: Of course, to implement that recommendation, if it were done, would take a very considerable period of time. The hon. member must understand that could not be done in a year or two.

MR. THOMAS: I recognize that.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Would the hon. member really be in favour of the uniform system of assessment to be put into effect on and after a certain date? There are a lot of

municipalities which are assessed by a different yardstick and it would put them to great expense going over and re-assessing again. I think the re-assessing is coming along nicely.

Four hundred odd municipalities in the Province of Ontario have been reassessed up to the present time. Ottawa City will be completed this year and Hamilton and Guelph.

The municipalities are uniformly assessed according to the Manual. I hope, without making it mandatory, that all the municipalities in the Province of Ontario within the next five years will be re-assessed. We were disappointed in one thing, as the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) well knows. The members of the districts were always coming to the Mayors and Reeves Association and saying, "Why do you not put in district assessors?" We pay $150 for each district for an assessor and the districts cannot agree among themselves as to whom to appoint. Under those conditions, how are you going to get uniform assessment?

MR. THOMAS: I realize there is a great difficulty, but if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will allow me a little longer, I think I will explain what in my opinion will eventually happen. Of course I am just an "ordinary Joe"

but I have some very firm opinions in respect to that. I am afraid the government will just throw them in the wastepaper basket, I do not know, but while I am prepared to criticize, I am also prepared to offer some constructive proposal.

When the grants were given in 1949, I stated, when speaking in the debate at the time, that giving grants on a population basis was a recognition of the unfairness of grants on an assessment basis. I think that is a fair statement to make. It was a recognition at that time.

HON. MR. FROST: May I point out that the Fire and Police grants did not really work on a population basis. I think the hon. member will recognize that it was on a cost basis.

MR. THOMAS: The recognition was there that the time had come when the grants on assessment could not be distributed equitably and fairly. It did seem the government at the time was a little uncertain, and now we have a reversal of that policy. Even on a per capita basis I do not think grants can be distributed fairly. I am well aware that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his staff are earnestly working for an equalized assessment throughout the Province, but it is a big

job. It is difficult, sometimes, to educate the local councils to appreciate the need for the change. In the meantime grants on assessment are not satisfactory.

Even last night in the debate when the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) introduced his estimates, in reply to a question by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) he said there were some places where they were getting 84 per cent of the total cost of education and some where they were getting 92 per cent. Yet according to the statement made by the hon. member for St. Andrew , he said the City of Toronto was getting 12 per cent of the cost of education. That I think will show the disproportion in the present method of giving grants. Something has to be done to make them a little fairer, to distribute them more equitably.

I do believe the day will come, when some person may have to take a very broad view of this whole picture and realize that the grants system will take such a long time to accomplish. anything, that the Government will have to assume the total cost of one service in co-operation with the Federal Government, and that will be the cost of education, and cut off some of the fringes outside.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister is looking very hurt at what I have said, but that is the opinion I hold. I think it will take a long time before equalized assessment will come.

We have to agree that while the sincerity of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) and his staff is not questioned, we still have to deal with the human element, the local people who are very hard to convince.

The costs of education today are steadily increasing -- the burden for the municipalities is too great. According to the report of the Minister of Education for 1951 the sum of $91,669,593 had to be met by the local Boards of Education. Mr. Speaker, that was for one year. The local boards received $46,875,998 from the Provincial government and the total cost for education for the year ending 1951 was $138,545,591. For 1952 and 1953 it will be larger still. Some hon. members may ask, if the province, with the Dominion government, assumes the total cost of education, from where is the money coming? If the sum paid out by the government for 1951 was added to the reduction in corporation taxes granted by the Provincial and Federal governments to the rich corporations in 1952 and 1953, I think more than enough would be collected to

meet the total cost of education.

I want to say a word about accident prevention. The Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has listened to this for quite a long time and I know it is something with which very sympathetic, and that is the participation of the workers on accident-prevention committees.

The hon.Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) is well acquainted with the arguments for and against the worker's right to participate in accident prevention. An article in the Daily Star of February 28, stated compensation to workers injured in industry for the year-ending 1952 had amounted to $29 million, four million more than in 1951. I know payrolls have increased and the number of workers who may be injured has increased, but even considering that fact, this increase is a substantial one. I wish the hon. Minister of Labour would give further consideration to providing labour representation on the Accident Prevention Board. I believe employers are concerned respecting accident prevention, but fundamentally, to the manufacturers it is a question of a decrease or increase in premiums, but the worker has a much greater interest, for it might mean the loss of an arm, a leg, an eye or even life itself.

I am asking the hon. Minister of Labour to seriously consider this question once again of allowing employee representation on accident committees. I feel quite sure that it would be very wise.

HON. MR. DALEY: I would like to inform the hon. member that we had been giving a great deal of consideration to that, as I have said before, but the lack of space in which to administer our department is curtailing our efforts to some extent. We expect to be in a new building within a few months, possibly within a few weeks, and we are moving all the accident-prevention groups in there.

We will have closer liaisons and I believe and hope we will be able to develop better ways and means of carrying on, even under the present system. I indicated in this House last year, and I believe the year before, that while I was not suggesting that accident prevention was perfect, I did not want to lose what we already had, thousands of volunteer workers performing in my opinion a very useful service. We did not want to lose them, until we had a better way of doing it.

I have indicated to Labour that I would give consideration to establishing an accident group of labour similar to what we have now in

the employer group. I have had some discussions with some of the top-ranking labour people but as yet we have not been able to evolve a way to do these things.

I assure the hon. member that we are giving it very careful consideration.

MR. THOMAS: I do appreciate the sincerity of the hon. Minister of Labour and I am very grateful for the assurance that something will be done.

In conclusion I would like to say something about the unsatisfied judgment fund. I appreciate the remarks made by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) this afternoon. Of course he was dealing with it from a legal angle. I cannot do that, much as I would like to, but I am going to try to make my point by expressing the sentiment of the average person in the street.

According to the report of the Department of Highways for 1952, over $3 million has been paid out since 1948, and up to that time only $94,595 has been recovered from the Judgment debtors. Roughly about 3 per cent has been recovered. Now the licence of a judgment debtor is withdrawn, and until the final payment is made the licence to drive a car is withheld. Sometimes through carelessness, absentmindedness or financial strain, persons who do not take out

insurance are involved in accidents. Some one may say, "Well, if they can't afford to take out insurance on their car, then they shouldn't drive."

Mr.Speaker, while the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund has some merit, it does recognize the principle of compulsory insurance. Every driver of an automobile had to pay a fee of $1 into the fund before obtaining his or her driving licence for 1953. The tremendous increase in car insurance rates is encouraging people to take a chance and drive their cars without insurance. Insurance premiums in Ontario sold by private companies are two and three times higher than premiums sold by the Saskatchewan government and, what is more, the Saskatchewan policy covers physical injury to the driver of a car even if he was at fault. One of the reasons insurance rates are so high in Ontario is because out of every dollar collected in premiums, 47 cents is spent for administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite well aware that the Minister of Highways has turned down the request for compulsory insurance. May I remind him, Mr. Speaker, without going into further detail on compulsory insurance, that the present Government in Saskatchewan was the first government to introduce compulsory automobile insurance.

They were elected to administer the affairs of that Province in 1944, 1949 and again in 1952, with an even greater majority. Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree you cannot fool the people continuously for a period of eight years. The compulsory auto insurance in Saskatchewan is now accepted by the people of that Province. The hon. Premier has stated on many occasions that he believes in committees of the House being appointed to consider and discuss matters of importance to the people of Ontario. Here is an opportunity where he can put a committee to work, and it would be possible to bring in a report on compulsory auto insurance at the next session of the Legislature. The States of Nevada and New York did exactly that, why not the Province of Ontario.

I would like to quote from the Brantford Expositor:

> "Ontario's Minister of Highways, Mr. Doucett, says there will be no compulsory insurance for motor car owners or drivers because it would be too expensive. This is a matter for argument, but if insurance is out, the Minister ought to see that something equivalent is in. There is more than one way of keeping irresponsible drivers, young or old, off the roads, and it is high time the Government began taking an effective step in this direction."

If my suggestion is not acceptable to the hon. minister, then I believe if we are to be saddled with the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund

for a little longer, the payment of $5,000 for death or injury to one person and the $10,000 damage to property arising out of such accident should be increased. With the great increase in the cost of hospitalization medical services and automobile repairs, I do think there is need for an upward revision in these amounts.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

(Take E follows)

The House in Committee; Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

THE METROPOLITAN AREA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order, House again in Committee on Bill No. 80, "An Act to provide for the Federation of the Municipalities in the Toronto Metropolitan Area for certain Financial and other Purposes", Mr. Frost.(Victoria).

On Section 40.

MR. H. E. BECKETT (York East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that Section 40 of Bill No. 80 be amended by adding thereto, the following subsection:

"Subsection 2: Nothing in this subsection 1 shall prohibit the area municipality or local board from supplying water to any other municipality, where the area municipality or local board has agreed to supply such water before the 1st of April, 1953, and the works and trunk distribution mains used or required in carrying out such an agreement have not been assumed by the Metropolitan Corporation" .

The amendment agreed to.

MR. SALSBERG: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to return for a moment to Section 37, because last night I do not think we dealt with it, and there was a discussion as to

whether we should proceed or not.

Section 37 of the Act provides for the taking over of all public works by the new Metropolitan Council.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is a great deal of good common sense, and quite a bit of justice in the request made by the City Council of the city of Toronto to the Government, within the last day or two, to provide legislation to compensate the city for the loss of this important asset.

On the other hand, I know it might be suggested --

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I have had all kinds of representations, which I can assure the hon. members have been studied and gone through with a fine tooth comb, and I never heard that one officially. I read about it in the papers.

There is no use beating the air on this subject. The city of Toronto -- I think very courageously -- made an application for amalgamation some three years ago. They suggested afterwards that such amalgamation could not take place at one fell swoop, but would have to be done on a planned basis, over a period of years. May I point out to the hon. member for St. Andrew that if we, for instance,

had a Bill before us providing for complete amalgamation within a period of ten or fifteen years, these things would all go into the amalgamation. There is no way, Mr. Chairman, of which I know, in the realm of what is practical, of allowing compensation in a case of annexation or amalgamation. It is impossible. Of course, there would be then a unification of these services. There is really nothing in this Bill done differently from what the city itself proposed, other than there is not a time limit for total amalgamation, nor in this Bill does it say there will be total amalgamation. As a matter of fact, there is unification of services, and this is the only way you can do it. The matter of one municipality paying for one thing, and another paying for another, just cannot be. This area is a great partnership; it has to be, and I would say to the hon. member for St. Andrew that what he suggests is not in the realm of practicality. May I point out again, Mr. Chairman, that the services which are being unified here, are not taken from anybody, nor does this deprive the people of the use of those things. As they are brought into the system, they are used alike by all the people in this great partnership.

This works in several different ways, and

I would point out to the hon. member that what he is talking about is an academic thing, which is quite impossible. It is impossible also from a fiscal standpoint. If you put everything down in dollars and cents, one paying for one thing, and somebody else paying for another, you can never have any amalgamations or annexations in Ontario of any kind. It is academic and is impossible.

MR. SALSBERG: I understand the City Council at its last meeting adopted a number of resolutions, one of which was a request to the provincial Government for compensation, unless they had what they called a "guarantee".

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member for St. Andrew is right.

MR. SALSBERG: I checked on it this morning.

HON. MR. FROST: It says:

> "Failing assurance that the aim of this legislation is ultimate amalgamation, the Bill should be amended to provide for compensation for the sewage and water-works to be assumed by the Metropolitan Council".

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this just cannot be done. It would be folly to provide by this Bill that as of January, 1960, or 1965,

there should be amalgamation. I think it would be a very grave mistake.

I think, on the other hand, to say that in the Bill there shall never be amalgamation, but this would be a confederation for all time, would be a profound mistake.

I would say further, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of compensation in unification is just impossible. It is academic and it is impossible; it could never be worked. You just cannot do it.

MR. SALSBERG: I appreciate the hon. Prime Minister's argumentations, but I suggest to him and to the Government there is also a great deal of logic in the argumentation of the City Council. I am not a stickler for the "amalgomation-and-amalgamation-only" theory. I have my own views on that question.

But what is necessary to be understood is that the city of Toronto has a very expensive waterworks system, for which it will have paid a great deal of money, money provided by the taxpayers of Toronto, and the water consumers. The city of Toronto had a considerable surplus from the operations of the waterworks --

HON. MR. FROST: That will not be interfered with.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh yes it will.

HON. MR. FROST: They can still sell water by meter.

MR. SALSBERG: I understand they derived a considerable amount of profit annually from the sale of that water. It is also a fact -- and former members of Council will remember this -- that the members used to boast about having made a great deal of money out of the sale of water. All this will be lost.

HON. MR. FROST: No, it will not be lost.

MR. SALSBERG: Toronto has been a wholesaler until now. Now it becomes a buyer.

HON. MR. FROST: What would happen in the case of amalgamation?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister has a strong argument there from the point of view of amalgamation only, but looking at it from the point of view of the consuming public, they will unquestionably be obliged to pay higher water rates once the system is taken over, and the new capital projects will be undertaken.

I am not moving an amendment in accordance with the proposal by the City Council, because I doubt whether it would be according to the rules of the House, because it would necessitate asking the Government to pay compensation for the water-

works, I do not think we should ask the amalgamated area to pay for it; I think this Government should pay the city of Toronto a certain amount for the waterworks. However, I cannot move such an amendment as a private member because it calls for an expenditure of money.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member might ask the United Nations to pay it.

MR. SALSBERG: No, it is this Provincial Government which has the funds and which is now, by this legislation, taking away from Toronto this great asset and profits they made, and will oblige the water users of this city to pay more, because the city of Toronto will become nothing but a retail distributor of water, while the Metropolitan waterworks will be selling to the city of Toronto.

I think it is not outlandish; it is not too much / to ask the Government to reimburse the city in a lump sum payment which would, in the long run, affect the tax rate of Toronto citizens.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: There is something there which is being overlooked entirely. Who will pay for the operation of that plant? The entire area. Will that not reduce the costs? I should think so.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, may I remind

the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that the moment this is taken over, millions of dollars in capital works will be undertaken and somebody is going to pay for that.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot let that go without making some remark. The hon. member knows as well as I that the recommendation by Mr. Storrie, was that the cost of extensions would be somewhere in the neighborhood of $10 million. That recommendation was made a few years ago, and it would cost more now for the extention of the plant, but, assuming it remained at $10 million, the entire area would be paying that amount, which Toronto would be called upon to pay otherwise.

The same applies to sewers and public works. Some of these water mains will have to be replaced and there is always the maintenance charges to be met, and the whole area will be looking after that, not Toronto alone, as they are doing today. It will make it much easier for the city of Toronto so far as maintenance is concerned, so far as the cost of producing the water is concerned, and the city will have the privilege of distributing the water within its own municipality. How are we to tell in advance what the price will be?

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs said, I cannot let that go.

THE CHAIRMAN: You were given indulgence to go back to Section 37. There is no amendment brought forward in regard to Section 37. I rule that this Committee is now dealing with Section 41.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the hon. member that we do not want to spend interminable time on merely academic matters.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not want to begin appealing the rulings by the Chairman, and I maintain it is not unreasonable to take a few minutes of the time of the House to speak on a matter which was adopted by the City Council at one of their meetings, on behalf of the people of Toronto.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Was this matter discussed at a meeting on Adelaide Street, where you have been present during your fore-noons?

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know what part of Adelaide Street the hon. Minister is referring to. May I bring him up to date. If my suspicions are correct, the part of Adelaide Street to which he refers has been changed many months ago. Ask me, and I will give you the new address.

(TAKE F FOLLOWS)

But it may have been discussed in the City Hall, as undoubtedly it was because there was an official motion carried by, I believe, a unanimous vote of the City Council of Toronto, the Mayor, Controllers and Aldermen.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: And the hon. member was right there.

MR. SALSBERG: I am proud to have been there.

Sections 41 and 42 agreed to.

Section 43 agreed to.

Section 44:

Subsection (1) agreed to.

On subsection (2):

MR. FISHLEIGH: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, the purpose of which actually is to correct a typographical error of the Printer to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, Baptist Johnston. This error occurs in Part III, Section 2, and it becomes necessary to strike out the words "with the like approval," which means if you had water for twenty years for your hand servant and your maid servant and your horse and your donkey, you could make a new deal and have the water continued; but if we leave in "with like approval," you will have to draw up another Bill 80 and might not have the "Silent Six" to help you out.

I move, Mr. Chairman, that subsection (2) of Section 44 of the Bill be amended by striking out the words "with the like approval" in the fifth line, so that the subsection reads as follows:

> "(2) The Metropolitan Corpora- may enter into a contract for the supply of water to any local municipality outside the Metropolitan Ares for its use or for resale to the inhabitants thereof for any period not exceeding twenty years, and may renew such contract from time to time for further periods not exceeding twenty years at any one time."

Section 44, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 45 and 46 agreed to.

On Subsection (1) of Section 47:

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to subsection (1) of Section 47, and in speaking on this subsection I must necessarily refer to Section 54.

Sections 47 and 54 deal at the present time with the divesting of certain assets which the Metropolitan Council will be taking care of. Section 47 permits the Metropolitan Corporation to sell these assets, these undertakings which they may have acquired, and only in a case where they are not being used for that purpose is

the approval of the Municipal Board required.

Section 54 contains a provision, where, by by-law, the Metropolitan Corporation may divest themselves of the undertaking and have it revert to the :Area Municipality.

The purpose of my amendments is to make Section 47 subject to Section 54, so that, where the Metropolitan Corporation wishes to sell a property acquired, they must first, if the Area Municipality believes it is required for their own purposes, refer it back to the Area Municipality.

The second part provides that the Metropolitan Corporation cannot simply by by-law revert back to the Area Municipality something which that Area Municipality may not want; so the situation will now be that the Metropolitan Corporation cannot sell any undertaking it may have acquired without first obtaining the consent of the Area Municipality, and, secondly, the Metropolitan Corporation cannot revert back to the Area Municipality that which they may not want.

Therefore, I move that subsection (1) of Section 47 of the Bill be amended by inserting at the commencement thereof the words "Subject to Section 54", so that the subsection

shall read as follows:

> "(1) Subject to Section 54, the Metropolitan Corporation may sell, lease or otherwise dispose of any real or personal property acquired, held or used for or in connection with the waterworks system which, in the opinion of the Metropolitan Council, is no longer required for the purposes of the waterworks system, but where the property is actually used for the purposes of the waterworks system no such sale, lease or other disposition shall be made without the approval of the Municipal Board."

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the principle of the amendment, but does this not establish in principle the fact that the Municipality retains a vested right in the property? That is contrary to the argument advanced a few minutes ago when I spoke about compensating a municipality for the system taken over. You say it ceases to be theirs once the Metropolitan Corporation comes into being. I thinkit should be recognized here that there is an acknowledgement of the rights of a vested municipality,even after unification, in the properties which it has.

Section 47, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 48 and 49 agreed to.

On Section 50:

MR. BECKETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like

to move that Section 50 of the Bill be amended by adding thereto the following as clause (a):

> "(a) to assume as a Metropolitan work any local work;
>
> and by relettering clauses (a) to (d) inclusive as clauses (b) to (e) inclusive, so that the Section shall read as follows:
>
> 50. If the Council of an area municipality considers itself aggrieved by the refusal of the Metropolitan Corporation or the Metropolitan Council,
>
> (a) to assume as a metropolitan work any local work;
>
> (b) to construct any extension of the metropolitan distribution system;
>
> (c) to maintain or increase the supply of water to the area municipality;
>
> (d) to approve the construction or extension of any local water distribution works by the area municipality; or
>
> (e) to permit the connection or the continuance of a connection to the metropolitan system,
>
> the council may appeal to the Municipal Board which may make such order as it deems advisable in the matter, and the decision of the Municipal Board shall be final."

The purpose of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, is that under Section 37 of the Act, the Metropolitan Corporation is required to assume all works for the production, treatment and storage

of water; if they do not do that, then an Area Municipality may appeal to the Municipal Board and the Municipal Board will make the order.

This brings it into line with Section 68 of the Act in respect to sewage works.

Section 50, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 51 to 53 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 54:

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, I have an amendment to Section 54. I move that Section 54 of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

> "54. Where a distribution main has been assumed by the Metropolitan Corporation under Section 37, and, in the opinion of the Metropolitan Council, is no longer required for the purposes of the Metropolitan waterworks system but is, in the opinion of the council of the area municipality in which it is situate, required as a local distribution main by the area municipality, the Metropolitan Council shall by by-law remove the main from the metropolitan waterworks system and transfer it to the area municipality."

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Free of charge.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the hon. member for St. Andrew that any principle is recognized here; in other words, since no asset was transferred which had to be

paid for by the Metropolitan Council to begin with, this is a transfer back to the area municipality where it came from, without any payment for any asset.

In addition, because no asset has been transferred or changed hands as such, the area municipality does not have to take back something it does not need.

Section 54, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 55 to 57 inclusive agreed to.

Part IV; on Section 58:

MR. SALSBERG: The same argument applies.

Sections 58 to 60 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 61:

MR. COLLINGS: Mr. Chairman, there is a new subsection to Section 61. Under subsection (1) of Section 61, the Metropolitan Council is required to pass by-laws assuming as metropolitan works all treatment works vested in any area municipality or any local board of an area municipality. By-laws must be passed before December 1st, 1953, and must be effective on January 1st, 1954.

It may be desirable in certain local instances to leave a particular treatment works with the area municipality temporarily, or the Metropolitan Corporation might find, after

December 1st, 1953, that it had omitted some treatment works from its by-laws.

In order to ensure that the by-law may be passed at a later date, this amendment authorizes a by-law assuming any specific work to be passed after December 1st, 1953, with the approval of the Municipal Board. The amendment is the same in effect as subsection (4) of Section 37, with respect to the assumption of water production works or distribution mains.

I move that Section 61 of the Bill be amended by renumbering subsections (4), (5) and (6) as subsections (5), (6) and (7), and adding the following as subsection (4):

> "(4) Notwithstanding subsection (1), a by-law for assuming any specific treatment works may, with the approval of the Municipal Board, be passed after the 1st day of December, 1953, and in that case the by-law shall become effective on the date provided therein."

Section 61, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 62 to 64 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 65:

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection (3) of Section 65 be amended by adding at the end thereof the words "in the same manner as if the work were being or had been constructed,

extended or improved by the area municipality", so that the subsection shall read as follows:

> "(3) The area municipality may pay the amounts chargeable to it under this Section out of its general funds or, subject to the approval of the Municipal Board, may pass by-laws under Section 389 of The Municipal Act for imposing sewer rates to recover the whole or part of the amount chargeable to the area municipality in the same manner as if the work were being or had been constructed, extended or improved by the area municipality."

Mr. Chairman, the reason for the amendment is that under Section 65 the Metropolitan Council, with the approval of the Municipal Board, is authorized to charge to an area municipality a portion of the capital cost of any work which will give to the municipality a special benefit. Under subsection (3) the area municipality is then authorized to pass by-laws under Section 389 of the Municipal Act to impose sewer rates to recover the amount chargeable to the municipality, and these rates may be imposed on land that derives a particular benefit from the work, rather than on the municipality at large.

Subsection (2) of Section 389 of The Municipal Act authorizes that it be charged only where the municipality is about to construct

the works.

Subsection (5) of Section 39 provides for the charging of special rates in respect to an existing work.

Mr. Chairman, it is therefore necessary to make it clear that the authority of the municipality is the same as it would have been if it were constructing the work or had constructed the work. This amendment gives effect to that purpose, and is an added safeguard to area municipalities.

Section 65, as amended, agreed to.

On Section 66:

MR. BECKETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that Section 66 of the Bill be amended by renumbering subsection (2) as subsection (3), and adding the following as subsection (2):

> "(2) The Metropolitan Corporation may enter into a contract with any local municipality outside the Metropolitan Area to receive and dispose of sewage or land drainage from the local municipality on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon for any period not exceeding twenty years, and may renew such contract from time to time for further periods not exceeding twenty years at any one time."

(G-1 follows)

The purpose of that, Mr.Chairman, is that any municipality on the fringe of the Metropolitan Area may make arrangements to come from that fringe area into the Metropolitan Corporation. According to this, they may supply water outside and I have always thought that sewage should be included.

MR. SALSBERG: Would this amendment cover such an area as the planned town known as Yorkton?

MR. BECKETT: Yes, that is the purpose of it.

MR. SALSBERG: I understand they already have the pipes laying in the area. Evidently they felt very confident this amendment would go through because the pipes are already on the ground and ready to be put in.

MR. BECKETT: This is part of my riding and there is no provision in the new subdivision for sewage disposal. This amendment provides for that.

HON. MR. FROST: With reference to the amendment moved by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Beckett) I would just like to say at this point that the other day I was reciting in a rather heated manner the qualifications of this band of members from the Toronto and York areas. I believe I went so far as to mention

that the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr.Salsberg) who has not found any ground to support any section of this Bill, himself had been an Alderman of the City of Toronto. I was very interested to learn after many months that the hon. member for East York who is the Solicitor for the township of Scarborough and some other municipalities out there, who is a man of encyclopaedic knowledge of that area and of what has taken place, was the Secretary of a committee appointed to inquire into the unification or amalgamation some twenty years ago, back in 1932 or 1933. The hon. member was the secretary for that committee and had already gone through much of the detail involved in this Bill which is before us at this time.

MR. SALSBERG: Is he a class mate of yours?

HON. MR. FROST: He is a class mate of mine, but when you look at my grey hairs and his grey hairs and then look at the hair of the Chairman who is also a classmate of mine you can see that time has dealt very lightly with certain members.

MR. E. L. WEAVER (St.David): I think the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is mistaken in his idea with respect to this section. The purpose of this section has

nothing to do with sewage connections in an area within the Metropolitan Area, but with an area municipality outside the Metropolitan Area, and this Yorkton subdivision, to which the hon. member refers, is as I understand it, a subdivision within the Metropolitan Area.

Amendment agreed to.

Sections 68 to 71 inclusive agreed to.

On section 72.

MR. BECKETT: I move an amendment to Section 72. My amendment is to add at the end thereof the words "And subject to subsection 2 of section 66 and any local municipality outside the Metropolitan area."

The section shall read as follows:

> "Any works assumed by the Metropolitan Corporation under the authority of section 61, together with any extensions or additions thereto constructed by the Metropolitan Corporation may be used by the Metropolitan Corporation for the purpose of receiving and disposing of sewage and land drainage, from any or all of the area municipalities subject to subsection 2 and section 66 and local municipality outside the Metropolitan area."

The purpose of this is to take care of any sewage that may come from outside any municipality, outside the Metropolitan area.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 73 agreed to.

Part V, sections 74 and 75 agreed to.

On Section 76.

MR. SALSBERG: This is by way of getting information. It may be impossible to dam the flood tide but at any rate let us be clear where we are being carried. One of the chief magistrates of the affected municipalities made a statement a few days ago to the effect that the government is unloading on the newly proposed municipality twenty odd miles of road which was formerly provincial highway. If that statement is true, and I believe it to be true, then it certainly is dealing very harshly with this new municipality you are setting up. You are unloading twenty miles of highway that has been paid for and maintained and now the municipality must assume responsibility.

It is true certain segments of roads here and there are being included in the provincial system, but Mr. Cranford, I believe it was, made a statement very positively, and it was he who gave mileage exactly, and I really think that is unfair. Certainly the burden in so far as roads are concerned should not be added to, and all the roads which have been cared for by the Provincial Government until now at least should be retained and cared for by the Province. It is a rather serious

matter, adding twenty odd miles of roadway to the Metropolitan Area.

HON. MR. FROST: I think it will be found that in total the area benefits very greatly. Of course there has to be adjustments in this matter but the arrangements with relation to roads in this area is indeed very broad. Going outside of the Metropolitan area, first of all, the entire present county road system is taken into the suburban system. The remaining county may start up a county road system of its own, but that is entirely up to them.

Then there is the Markham Road running to Markham and Sutton which in itself is a great thing. The Province comes in and pays a subsidy of fifty per cent and treats the Metropolitan roads as county roads.

There is a huge sum being expended in this area in the highways that are surrounding this city. I do not know whether the hon. member for St. Andrew, ever had the opportunity to leave his riding for a while, and go up and look at the immense road installations which are being made in this area, running north of the city, going around to Brown's Line and over to the Rouge.

It is really a tremendous development.

Not only from the standpoint of roads but from the standpoint of over-all benefits and

contributions and costs, the area will benefit very greatly in this matter. I realize there are roads which are presently important, which may not remain important and may be changed from one class to another.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: There is one very important part the hon. member for St.Andrew has missed. He is always talking about what Toronto is paying and he has forgotten about the arterial highways going north, west, and east from the city, on which they will receive 50 per cent instead of 33-1/3 which they received formerly.

MR. SALSBERG: I wish to assure the hon. Minister (Mr.Dunbar) I have not forgotten a thing, but remembering all these things does not in any way alter the fact that twenty odd miles of highway previously cared for by the Province is now turned over to the Metropolitan area and they will have to pay for it.

Sections 76 to 81 agreed to.

On Section 82.

MR. E. L. WEAVER: I have an amendment to this section. Regarding the "tanning operations" which have been going on around this house in the last two or three days, I have heard several members use the expression that you must take the "tail with the hide", and

the amendment which I propose to this section has the effect of imposing upon the Metropolitan Corporation the liabilities which the area municipality have, as well as giving to the Metropolitan Corporation all powers and privileges and rights, with respect to roads that are taken over and incorporated in the Metropolitan road system.

I would also like to say at this time that this amendment is one which has been suggested by the Council of the City of Toronto. This Committee of members which has been going over this Act, has considered very carefully and very seriously all of the suggestions of members that have been put forward, not from the City of Toronto but from the County of York and from various municipalities in the County of York, and from the Board of Trade. This amendment comes as a result of the very careful consideration by that committee and its representations.

I move that Section 82 be amended by inserting after the word "conferred" in the third line, the words "an be subject to all liabilities imposed,"

So that the section shall read as follows:

"82. The Metropolitan Corporation shall, in respect of the roads or streets included in the Metropolitan

road system, have all the rights, powers, benefits and advantages conferred and be subject to all liabilities imposed, either by statute, by-law, contract or otherwise upon the Corporation of the County of York or the Corporation of the area municipality or the corporations of two or more area municipalities which had jurisdiction over the roads before they were assumed by the Metropolitan Corporation, and the Metropolitan Corporation may sue upon such rights or under such agreement or by-laws in the same manner and to the same extent as the Conty of York or the area municipality or municipalities as the case may be, might have done if the roads had not been assumed as Metropolitan roads."

Section 82 as amended agreed to.

Sections 83 to 90 inclusive agreed to

(Page H-1 follows)

Sections 91 to 100 inclusive agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, tomorrow I would like to pass the next two Parts, so on Friday we may go into the Parts which are not contentious, Parts VIII, IX, X, XI and XIII. This may be done, and then we can return to Parts VI, VII, XII, XIV and XV.

MR. OLIVER: How many will we take up tomorrow?

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I plan tomorrow to have a speech or two on the Budget, and then go on with Bill 80, and take up the Estimates of the Department of Mines, the Department of Reform Institutions, and the Department of Municipal Affairs, in that order.

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report progress, and begs leave to sit again.

Motions agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following Bills were given third reading:

Bill No. 5, "An Act to Incorporate the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association of London".

Bill No. 28, "An Act respecting the Town of Orillia".

Bill No. 63, "An Act to amend The Securities Act".

Bill No. 68, "An Act to amend The Research Council Act, 1948".

Bill No. 74, "An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act".

Bill No. 76, "An Act to amend The Certified Public Accountants Act".

Bill No. 77, "An Act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act".

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bills do now pass and be intituled as in the motions.

THE CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. Oliver, in the absence of Mr. Reaume, moves second reading of Bill No. 15, "An Act respecting the City of Windsor".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dunlop moves second reading of

Bill No. 110, "An Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I ask that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Education.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill; Bill No. 110 referred .

.

THE LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dunbar moves second reading of Bill No. 112, "An Act to maned the Local Improvements Act".

MR. OLIVER: Is this Bill going to the Committee?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill; Bill referred.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Frost moves second reading of Bill No. 115, "An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act".

He said: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants this Bill held over, I will be very glad to hold it. This Act is one which removes the payment of any tax on an estate below an amount of $50,000. The situation at the present time is

that a widow or a preferred class of beneficiaries are exempt from tax if the estate is $50,000 or under, but if it should amount to $50,001., they are liable for the whole tax, which might amount to several hundred dollars. This Bill provides there shall be no impingement on the $50,000. Perhaps it might be better discussed in Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Frost moves second reading of Bill No. 116, "An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act".

He said: The details of this Bill were given in the Budget, and contained in the Schedule. It was not in the Speech, either tabled or extemporaneous. An explanation was given in the Schedule. This concerns a matter of contributions by corporations to pension funds of their employees, and covers the years 1950, 1951 and 1952.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, whether that was at the request of the corporations, or was it an unsolicited gift.

HON. MR. FROST: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it was the carrying out of an arrangement made some years ago. As a matter of fact, when we went back into the corporation tax field in 1947, provision for these deductions was not included in the Act. The Federal Government provided for such deductions in their Act, which they introduced in 1950. The province did not follow suit until 1952, and I think the arrangement then was these deductions would be carried forward for a period of five years from that time. When the agreement was entered into last year, of course, the provision for deductions which it was intended to apply, ended, because there were no further taxes.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, most of these corporations, which would be entitled to that deduction, owe us money in connection with the adjustments. These amount to a total of some $400,000 or $500,000. It was felt it was only fair in keeping that agreement, to make this arrangement.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

THE CORPORATION AND INCOME TAXES SUSPENSION ACT, 1952

Hon. Mr. Frost moves second reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act to amend the Corporation and Income Taxes Suspension Act, 1952".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this relates to the Suspension Act, which was passed last year, obviating the necessity of filing returns except when they are requested. In other words, the voluminous returns required by the Government are, by this legislation, obviated.

I have wondered sometimes, Mr. Speaker, if it was desirable to do this. I felt probably the returns should be continued to be filed with the Government, as against any other possible arrangement with the Federal Government, or perhaps the re-entry under certain conditions into this field again.

However, I think it is entirely unnecessary, for this reason; the Department of the Provincial Secretary keeps a roll of the corporations in any event, and to receive these returns which have little meaning, unless they were collated in different ways, would involve a very large expenditure. Information which might be on the doubtful side is usually available through the Bureau of Statistics, and it was felt it was better to remove this necessity, which relieves the province of paying perhaps a quarter of a million dollars for staff to collect information which may not be desired, in addition to causing the corporation

very large expense in connection with their staff.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. FROST: I think that completes the work for today.

MR. OLIVER: Are we going to proceed with the speeches on the Budget immediately after the House opens tomorrow?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes. I believe there are two speakers, one the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney). Then we might deal again with Bill No. 80, and then go into the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, there may be some Bills with which we might want to deal if we have time, but they will be Bills of a non-controversial nature.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - - - -

JUL 17 1958